

*The SURVEY impartially Examined by sacred
Scripture and sound Reason.*

BEING AN (d)
ANSWER to a late PAMPHLET
ENTITLED,
A SURVEY, &c.

WROTE BY
Mr. THOS. CLARK, Seceding Minister at Ballybay.

Wherein it sufficiently Appears,

- I. That all the Author's Charges of unsound DOCTRINE and irregular PRACTICE against the GENERAL SYNOD are groundless Calumny and malicious Reproach.
- II. That the SECEDERS are base INTRUDERS.

TO WHICH IS ADDED,
Some OBSERVATIONS on Mr. CLARK's *Credentials*, and the political Principles of the *Seceders*.

With some Impartial REMARKS upon the Rev. EBENEZER ERSKINE's Synodical SERMON; and Mr. CLARK's mistaken Notion of the COVENANT of GRACE.

By JOHN SEMPLE, M. A. Minister of the Gospel in the united Congregation of *Anahilt* and *Hillsborough*.

DAN. V. 27. *Thou art weighed in the Balance, and found wanting.*
PROV. XXVII. 2. *Let another Man praise thee, and not thine own Mouth; a Stranger, and not thine own Lips.*

2 COR. X. 18. *For, not he that commendeth himself is approved, but whom the LORD commendeth.*

TITUS I. 10, &c. *For there are many unruly and vain Talkers, and Deceivers, whose Mouths must be stopped, who subvert whole Houses, teaching Things which they ought not, for filthy Lucre's sake. Wherefore rebuke them sharply, that they may be found in the Faith.*

BELFAST:

Printed and sold by JAMES MAGEE, in Bridge Street, 1754.

By reason of the Author's Distance from the Press, the following Typographical Errors have happened, which the candid Reader is requested to correct with his Pen.

Page 3 line 3, for *immediately*, read *accordingly*; p. 4 l. 9 from the bottom, for *Father*, r. *Fathers*; p. 21 l. 20, for *tullerit* r. *tulerit*; *ibid* l. 21, for *quorentes*, r. *querentes*; p. 22 l. 27, for *Sustance*, r. *Substance*; p. 23 l. 10 from the bottom, for *thus*, r. *this*; p. 25 l. 3, for *Athenasian*, r. *Athanasian*; p. 39 l. 11, for *were*, r. *was*; p. 54 l. 21, for *sick*, r. *rich*; p. 55 l. 14, for 175, r. 157; p. 65 l. 13, dele *but that*; p. 66 l. 9, dele *and*.

N. B. Mr. Clark, in order to vindicate his Brethren, publisheth his own Shame to the World, in the following Advertisement.

“ If there occur in this Paper, any typographical Mistakes, or unguarded Words, &c. let it not be imputed to any Member of the Associate Judicatures, in regard not one of them ever perus'd it until after Publication thereof, which was without their Consent ask'd or given.” — He hereby declares his Pride and Ignorance of the Discipline of one of the most famous Protestant Churches in Europe. See *Quick's Discipline of the French Church*, Chap. XIV. Canon 16. — “ Neither Minister, nor other Members of the Church, may print any Books, compos'd by themselves or others concerning Religion: nor may they at all publish them, until they have first communicated them to the Colloquy, i. e. the Presbytery.”

The Preface to the candid Christian Reader.

It is not out of Choice, but Necessity, that I have enter'd the Lists in this Controversy with the Seceders; for I sincerely love Peace with all Men, if I could purchase it upon reasonable Terms: but I am unwilling to procure it at the Expence of Truth.

I would far more chearfully been constantly employ'd in preaching the incontestel, necessary and important Doctrines of Christianity to my People; of Repentance towards God, Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, and Gospel Holiness, to promote their eternal Happiness.

'Tis Matter of Regret and Lamentation, that such shameful Schisms and Divisions among Christians, especially of the Protestant Denomination, do so abound. — These expose us to the Scorn and Reproach of others, alienate our tender Affections from one another, abate and cool our Love, and prey deeply upon the Vitals of Christianity. I can sincerely declare, that it is Matter of constant Grief to my Soul.

The Occasion of my writing was briefly this: I had been abroad from my People August 19th, 1750, assisting a Brother at the Celebration of the Lord's Supper; said Day a Seceder preach'd in the Bounds of this antient Congregation, and uttered (as I was inform'd) a great many groundless Calumnies, and bitter Invectives, against the General Synod: When I return'd, some of the most sensible People of my Congregation, requested me, that I would warn my People against giving Ear to such groundless Calumnies, and give some Account of the first Rise, Progress and particular Tenets of the Seceders; which accordingly I did soon after, and committed it to Writing, and read it from the Pulpit: the whole Substance of which is contain'd in this Answer.

Not long after I received two Challenges, one from Mr. Clark, and another from Mr. Magill, to send them a Copy of said Paper, or to go within a few Hours to a publick Dispute, at the Seceding Meeting-house of Louchachrey; or where else I thought proper. — I did not think it would answer any good End, for Ministers of the Gospel of Peace, to expose themselves in publick, like Prize-fighters upon a Stage, before a Multitude, many of whom are very incompetent Judges. I believed the Consequence would be to fill the

Country with false Representations and Lies. I return'd them an Answer, that what I had wrote and delivered to my People, I intended soon to print, and then they might have an Opportunity of seeing it. The Seceders were then intolerably Insolent and Impertinent; for not long after, several of my Brethren in this Presbytery, received Challenges by Writing from them to a publick Dispute also: and all of them were of the same Mind; they thought it would not serve any valuable End.

Soon after Mr. Clark's Book appear'd, several Persons importun'd me, that I would make some Remarks upon it; but I waited a considerable Time, expecting Mr. Peebles would have answer'd it, which I know he was very capable to do. But he declining it, at length I complied with the Importunity of my Friends; and wou'd have finish'd this Answer much sooner, but could not spare much Time, having the Pastoral Charge of so numerous a Flock.

I can sincerely declare, that my chief End in writing it, the Glory of God and the Good of Souls. In order to this, to vindicate the Principles and Practice of our General Synod, from the many groundless Calumnies, and false Aspersions, which many malicious Tongues, and our Author in particular hath loaded us with.—And, to open (if possible) the Eyes of some pious well-Meaning Christians, who, in the Simplicity of their Hearts have hitherto followed them. And to prevent any who have not, from joining them, either constantly, or even occasionally hearing them: least they be allur'd by their fair Speeches, whereby they lye in wait to deceive the Hearts of the Simple.

If any Remark, that I have reprov'd them too sharply in this Answer: I would have them consider; that Acrimony of Style is not always inconsistent with the Character of a Minister of the Gospel, but sometimes his incumbent Duty; as the Apostle enjoins the Evangelist, Titus i. 13. Rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the Faith. I am conscious to myself, that it was from a sincere Intention to promote the Good of thy Soul and the Souls of others, that I have done so. If these Things be attain'd, I have my Aim. I am,

Thy Soul's sincere Well-wisher, and

CABRA, May 1st.
1754.

Servant in the Gospel of Christ,

JOHN SEMPLE.

A N S W E R

TO A

P A M P H L E T, &c.

S E C T. I.

The GENERAL-SYNOD of Ulster have not judicially declared their Satisfaction with such heterodox, or unsound Principles, as are commonly known in this Kingdom by the Name NEW-LIGHT.

S I R,

I Would not have you nor any other Man, by what I am about to write, in answer to your Objections, against Mr. Carlisle's Sermon, to conclude, that I approve of every thing in that Sermon; by no means, for I was one of those at the Synod where it was delivered, who objected, and was dissatisfied with several things in it; and there are some things in it which I still dislike; yet I could wish it were in every body's Hands who read your Book, that Men might see how grossly you impose upon your Readers, and pervert his Words, contrary to their plain and obvious Meaning; sometimes you take disjointed Sentences, without considering the Author's Scope and Design, and place a Number of these together, and apply them to a Meaning he never intended. Thus, you have, in page 11th of your Survey, quoted two single Sentences, from page 11 and 14 of his Sermon, and fix a Meaning upon them, which he never intended; you have also quoted him very unjustly; sometimes adding to his Words, and sometimes diminishing, and not only have you made bold with human Writings, by unfair Quotations through your whole Book, but you have also made too free with the Word of GOD. This way also page 74, where you quote Judges v. 23. *Curse ye Meroz, saith the Angel of the Lord; curse ye bitterly the Inhabitants thereof, because they came not*

B

so th

A-SAMPLE

forth to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty: But you quote it, *the many and the mighty*, and put *many*, where the Spirit of God has not put it in. Were you not afraid of what God says, *Prov. xxx. 6. Add thou not unto his Words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a Lyar*; and of what is said *Rev. xxii. 18. If any Man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the Plagues that are written in this Book*?

And even in the very first Quotation, from the Preface, you do great injustice to our Author's Words, representing him as a most *vain-glorious Boaster* of his own Performance; the Words are these, "Most Ministers then at the General Synod, yea some Elders, and others also, were so wonderfully charm'd with it, &c." I positively aver, that the Words, *wonderfully charm'd*, are not in the Preface of the printed Sermon, but are foisted in by you, to represent him in the most disadvantageous Light, as the most vain glorious Person any where to be found——The very Words of the Preface are these,

"Though I was warmly solicited, by most of the Ministers at the General Synod, by some of the Gentlemen and Elders, to publish the following Sermon." I would here make a Remark; that by most of the Ministers of the General Synod, we are not to understand the major Part of the Ministers who were Members of that Synod in the thronest Days of their Meeting, *viz.* on *Wednesday* and *Thursday*, who amounted at that Synod almost to 80, but only the most part of the Ministers, who came in Time to hear Sermon, which Number frequently who come timeously upon *Tuesday* to hear Sermon bear but a very small Proportion to those who come afterwards, *viz.* late that Evening, and upon *Wednesday* Morning, very often not a fourth Part of the Whole, by reason of the great Distance of the Members Dwellings from the Place of the Synod's Meeting: Now if the most of those 20, or the major Part of them, which is only 11, requested the printing of the Sermon, it was but a very small Number: I would have this Remark duly attended to, by every one who reads either *Mr. Carlisle's* Sermon, or *Mr. Clark's* Book; for the former would make as much of the Number as he could, to justify his printing the Sermon, and the latter to represent the major Part of our Synod, *New-light Men*; whereas if this Observation be duly consider'd, it will

will undeceive the World with respect to what they both have said.

You add Page the 8th of your *Survey*; "And immediately, in order to forward this Work, they met that same Day in Judgment about it, and into whatsoever Hands it should come, that the Readers without Suspicion, might the better swallow down all the unsound Doctrines in it, they very kindly sugar it over with an Approbatory Sentence of their Court; which I here present you, extracted from their Records, signed by their Moderator and Clerk, an exact Copy whereof followeth; 'At an Interloquitur of the General Synod at *Antrim*, June the 18th, 1745. Some few Brethren who had taken Exceptions at some Expressions in *Mr. Carlisle's* Sermon, now desir'd, that he would satisfy them, they specified the Passages which they look'd on as offensive, and *Mr. Carlisle* condescended to read them, and gave such Explications of them, as were satisfying to those Brethren, and to this Interloquitur.

Extracted by *John Cochran*, Clk. S. G.

John Moorhead, Moderator.

I observe, from the Minute of the Interloquitur, that it was not those few, who desir'd him to print it, that mov'd for the Interloquitur, in order to recommend it to the Press, in a judicial way, as you would here insinuate, but those few who had taken Exceptions against some Expressions in it, in order to have their Scruples removed, or if he could not, or would not do it, to censure him; this was truly the Cause and Matter of Fact; and now Sir, all your Sugar is lost.

You add an Objection in these Words, "But you will now probably Object, saying, that it is neither generous nor just to charge upon the whole Synod these Doctrines taught only by one Member of it, now deceas'd." You answer, "It is a known Maxim in Logicks, that the Argument which proves too much proves nothing at all; and if you reckon it ungenerous or unjust to charge upon the whole Synod, that which was done and spoken by one Member thereof, acting with their Consent, aiding and assisting him in the Capacity of their Head or principal Agent, then by the same parity of Reason, you certainly must reckon it ungenerous and unjust in God, to charge *Achan's* Sin upon his whole Family;" you add,

" altho' *Adam* be dead, dare any of you reckon it un-
 " generous and unjust in God to impute his first Sin to his
 " Posterity?"

Sir, you are guilty here, of using very unsound Expressions, in calling the Moderator the Head of the Synod, which is the Church collective in *Usser*: No, Sir, no Man on Earth is our Head, CHRIST JESUS alone we own as our Head; whom the Father hath given to be Head over all things to his Church, which is his Body, *Eph. i. 22.* and it sounds very like Popery in you to attribute the Headship of the Church to any but Christ; I beseech you be more cautious and wary for the future, never to give that Honour and Glory to any other, which is due to him alone.

There seems to be no Parallel in the Instance you bring of many suffering for the Offence of one, of *Achan's* Family, and *Adam's* Offspring, having their Father's Sins imputed to them, and the Fault of Mr. *Carlisle* being imputed to all the Members of the Synod, unless you could prove (which is impossible) that the Connection and Relation is the same; for neither you nor any Man dare say, that there is the same Sort of Connection and Relation between Mr. *Carlisle* and the Members of the Synod, and *Adam* and his Offspring, who are physically speaking, Parts and Portions of his Flesh and Blood, who was not only our natural Head, but also our federal or Covenant-Head, even by a divine Appointment. I would remark that, it is very disputable, whether the Sons and Daughters of *Achan* were put to Death with their Father or not; a great many of the Jewish Rabi's alledge, that no human Creature suffer'd upon that Account but himself, that his Sons and Daughters were only brought out to see the Execution of their Father, and the Destruction of all the Goods that he had, and they are confirm'd in this Opinion, because the Law of God expressly saith, *Deut. xxiv. 16. The Father shall not be put to Death for the Children, neither shall the Children be put to Death for the Fathers, every Man shall be put to Death for his own Sin;* and I know particularly, that one of the most learned of the Jewish Rabi's, namely *Josephus*, in his Antiquities, when paraphrasing this Scripture, viz. *Joshua vii. 24, 25.* makes mention of the Death of neither Son nor Daughter that *Achan* had, but of the stoning and burning only of himself.——But those other Jewish Doc-

tors

tors who think it is plain from the Text, that they suffer'd with their Father, alledge it is very probable, they were privy to, and conscious of, their Father's Fact, and if this was the Case, they were Accessaries in assenting and assisting, or concealing their Father's Crime, and consequently were personally guilty of Death, and suffered only for their own Crime.——I shall now produce, for the Benefit of my other Readers, the Judgment of two of our late learned and judicious Commentators upon the Place, namely, Mr. *Pool* and Mr. *Henry*, tho' perhaps with such great Doctors as you, their Words may have little Weight. The judicious Mr. *Pool's* Words are these, " And considering that *Achan* was an old Man, as is most probable, " because he was the fifth Person from *Judah* (of which " see verse the 5.) it seems most likely, that the Children " were grown up, and so capable of knowing, conceal- " ing, or discovering this Fact; nor doth it follow that " they were not guilty, because it is not said so, for it " is apparent, that many Circumstances are omitted in " divers historical Relations in Scripture, which oftentimes " are supply'd in other Places."——The words of the pious Mr. *Henry* are, " Perhaps his Sons and Daughters " were Aiders and Abettors, in the Villany, had helped " to carry off the accursed things. It's very probable they " assisted, and that he could not hide them in the midst " of his Tent, but they must know and keep his Counsel, " and so they became Accessaries, *ex post facto*, and if " they were never so little Partakers in the Crime it was so " heinous, that they were justly sharers in the Punishment."

Now from what has been said it appears, that there is no such Connection or Relation between Mr. *Carlisle* and the other Members of the Synod, as between *Achan* and his Children, with regard to the above mention'd Crime; it was not for his Crime, but for their own that they were punish'd, if they were punish'd at all. It also appears that there is not (nor possibly can be) such a Connection and Relation between a Moderator and the Members of a Synod, as is between us and *Adam*, our natural Father, and covenant Head by a Divine Appointment: And so your two Instances of many being punish'd for the Sin of one, are brought to no Purpose, and the whole Objection that you made, of its being neither generous nor just in you to charge us, remains in its full Force against you still, notwithstanding

B 3

J. E. I. M. F. I. E. I. E.

withstanding of all you have done or can do. I might here desist, having overturn'd your Foundation, but shall proceed, to confider and refute what you next object. You say, "Perhaps it will be objected and alledged, that it was" not the offensive Expressions in the Sermon, but only "those Explications of them which Mr. *Carlise* gave." "that the Synod declar'd themselves satisfy'd with." To which I reply, Yes, truly it was just so as you have said ; it was not the Sermon it self, but the Explication which he gave of the offensive Expressions in it, which the Synod declar'd themselves judicially satisfy'd with, as is plain from the Minute of the Interloquitur, which you your self have quoted ; that it was the Explications he gave of the offensive Expressions, and not the offensive Expressions themselves that were satisfactory to the objecting Brethren, and to the whole Interloquitur ; so that the Sermon itself, neither as it was deliver'd, nor as it was printed, was ever judicially approv'd of by the Synod ; we only declar'd our Satisfaction as to his Soundness in the Faith according to the Declaration he gave us of it, with regard to these excepted Expressions, which we could have wish'd had been more cautiously worded. And this Falshood runs thro' your whole Book, that the appointing the Interloquitur was in order (as one may say) to give him the Thanks of the House, for his Sermon, and to enjoyn him in a judicial way, to commit it to the Press ; whereas it's plain to every Person of common Sense, from the Minute of the Interloquitur, that the Design of the Synod, in resolving itself into an Interloquitur, was to call him before us, to give us Satisfaction, and remove the Offence we had taken, by what was contain'd in the abovesaid excepted Expressions, and it is his Soundness in the Faith that the Synod approv'd, and never did the Synod approve of said Sermon in a judicial way, however some Members in a private Capacity might request him to print it.

I am surpriz'd to hear you say that this is a mere *trifling Evasion*: "Because, say you, it was only some few Members, who ever did take Exceptions at any one Expression in the Sermon, which implys that the Majority (who is always the Synod) were still well pleas'd with this Sermon."

To which I reply, Tho' there were but a few of the eldest Members (in comparison of the whole Synod) who spoke;

spoke; yet these spoke the Sense of a great many, whose Minds they had known concerning the Sermon, the Night before, and that Morning also, before the Interlocutor met, (which was on *Wednesday* the 19th, after the usual Hours of Prayer, and not the same Evening in which the Sermon was deliver'd. As the Printer of the Sermon has led you into a Mistake in this, I shall not accuse you for it) and this is usual in all our Judicatories, that when modest young Men have heard their Sense spoke exactly by their Fathers and elder Brethren they are silent; and I am able to prove to this Day, from the living Members who constituted that Synod, that the major Part of them by far, were dissatisfy'd with several Expressions in that Sermon; part of them by hearing it themselves, and part of them, who came up after it was deliver'd, by hearing the excepted Expressions spoke of by their Brethren who heard it; so that tho' but a few spoke as it is worded in the Minute, yet from the Testimony of these living Members who were the Majority, I can make it appear, the Majority did not approve, but disapprove of said Sermon.

You add, "It was but some Expressions which the few Brethren quarrelled at." To which I reply, can any Man of common Sense, nay even can you your self quarrel, at every individual Expression in the whole Sermon? What Exception have you to this one in it, page 32. "We can never be too sollicitous, in promoting the Honour and Kingdom of Christ, among Men, and serving his Interests, whose Zeal for our eternal Welfare, and for the Honour of his Father's Laws, brought him into this World of Sin and Sorrow and made him become a Propitiation for our Sins?" You add, "And even those few Brethren gave up the Cause at length, as satisfy'd also." If by the Cause here, which the objecting Brethren gave up, you mean the particular Truths which we alledged the excepted Expressions seemed to overturn or deny, it is manifestly false; for he gave, says the Minute of the Interloquitur, "such Explanations of them" i. e. the excepted Expressions, "as were satisfactory to these Brethren, and to this Interloquitur;" If by giving up the Cause you mean the objecting Brethren gave up the Debate, after they were satisfy'd with regard to Mr. *Carlisle's* Soundness in the Faith, after he had given us Satisfaction, it is true what you say, but nothing to

[9]

to your Purpose, for would you have Men to debate for Debating's sake after they were fully satisfy'd?

As to what Mr. *Carlisle* says in his Preface, which you would make all of in your Power against the Synod, viz. "that he still retained the obvious Sense and Meaning" contain'd in them," where you observe, that he alledgeth, "the excepting Brethren were so blind that they "could not see, tho' it was really plain and obvious." To which I reply, it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, for one Man to know that all Men have the same Sentiment or the same Ideas excited in their Minds by hearing his Words, that he has annexed to his Words, in his own Mind; for the most copious Language that we know, labours under a Penury or want of Words, to express our numberless Ideas by: Hence we find, that with respect to sundry Phrases and Expressions in Authors both antient and modern, human and divine, what to one, at first Sight in reading, or in hearing, obviously seems to be the Sentiment or Meaning of them, seems not so to another; and perhaps in this imperfect State, there is no help for it; unless (which yet hath not been attained to) some universal philosophical Character should be invented, so full, as to have a distinct Character for every Idea which at any time enters into the human Mind.

Having already made it evidently appear, that the General Synod never gave their Approbation of said Sermon in a judicial way, which may convince every unprejudic'd Mind, that you have acted very unjustly in charging the Synod for approving what they never did approve; yet I shall now attempt to shew the World, that you have argued very sophistically and falsely, and grossly perverted his Sense and Meaning in all those several things you accuse him with.

In the 9th Page you say, "I come now to consider some "of those unfound Doctrines contain'd in this Sermon; and "the first I shall take notice of at present is in Page 9th, "where there are two Expressions concerning the Grounds "of Hopes of Happiness, which taken conjointly or separately, form a very dangerous Doctrine, viz. 'To know "the Will of God and to perform it when known, which "alone is *true Religion*;' according to them, and as thus describ'd, Religion, say they, is that upon which *alone* "are grounded all Hopes of Happiness hereafter, when "this

"this frail (you have short) and transitory Life is at an "End." Now Sir, I shall consider these two Expressions both separately and conjunctly, and plainly shew my Readers, that they contain nothing but wholesome and sound Doctrine, a Doctrine according to Godliness.

The first of these, viz. To know the Will of God and to perform it when known is true Religion, is a Proposition so clear and plain in itself, that one is surpriz'd that any Man should call it in question; you have been the first that ever I knew, and I hope you will be the last that will deny it. I am surpriz'd that any Man that is in the calm Exercise of his Reason, that pays any Regard to the sacred Oracles of Truth, should say, That to know the Will of God, and to perform it when known, is not true Religion. Does not the whole current of the Scriptures, both of the old and new Testament confirm the above Proposition, as our *Westminster* Divines in answer to the Question, *What do the Scriptures principally teach?* Answer, "The Scriptures principally teach what Man is to "believe concerning God, and what Duty God requires "of Man." Is not here the whole Scope of the holy Scriptures (which undoubtedly contain the whole of the Christian Religion) said to teach us, what Man is to believe concerning God, and what Duty God requires of Man? Or, To know the Will of God and to perform it when known, *Mic. vi. 8. He hath shewed thee O Man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God? Eccles. xii. 13. Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God and keep his Commandments, for this is the whole Duty of Man. John xiii. 17. If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them. James i. 25. But who so looketh into the perfect Law of Liberty, and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful Hearer, but a Doer of the Work, this Man shall be blessed in his Deed.*—i. e. he who intently and diligently searches into the Mind of God, revealed in his Word, and perseveres in the Study, Belief and Obedience of this Doctrine, in all Conditions, under all Afflictions and Temptations, he has an Evidence of his begun Blessedness, and is in the way to his future perfect Happiness. Don't each of these four Scriptures plainly imply, that in knowing, and performing what God has revealed in his Word, the Whole of our Religion consists? Doth

J. H. J. M. F. H.

Doth not the revealed Will of God contain all the Doctrines and Duties of the Christian Religion? What Doctrines or Duties are in it, which the Word of God doth not contain? 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17. *All Scripture is given by Inspiration of God, and is profitable for Doctrine, for Reproof, for Correction, for Instruction in Righteousness, that the Man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good Works.* Is not here the Perfection of the holy Scriptures asserted, and their Sufficiency for all the Purposes of the Divine Life? Can there be any Doctrine in the true Religion, the Christian Religion, the Religion of Jesus, but what is revealed in the Word of God, or any Duty but what the same Word enjoins the Performance of?

Doth it not contain the Doctrine of our Creation, after the Image of God? our Fall and Misery? our Redemption and Recovery by Christ's Blood? many great and precious Promises of free Grace thro' him, to poor Sinners? of Peace, Pardon, and eternal Life to every true Believer, who receives him as the Father freely offers him in the Gospel? John vi. 40. *And this is the Will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son and believeth on him, may have everlasting Life.*

Having considered the first Proposition namely, to know the Will of God and to perform it when known, which alone is true Religion, exclusive of all the Additions of Men, either in Doctrine or Practice; — let us consider the

2d, Upon which alone are grounded all Hopes of Happiness after this short and transitory Life is at an End, *i. e.* upon the Promises contain'd in the Word of God, and particularly upon Christ Jesus, the chief Promise, in whom all the other Promises are Yea and Amen, and more especially upon this Promise, Acts xvi. 31. *Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy House.* Upon which alone, *i. e.* exclusive of all Merit of ours, any thing done on our Part, but only on account of Christ, freely offered to us in the precious Promises, all our Hopes of eternal Life are grounded, when this short and transitory Life is at an End. And what other Foundation can any poor Sinner of Adam's Race build his Hopes of Happiness upon, but Jesus Christ as held forth in the precious Promises of God's reveal'd Will? Acts iv. 12. 1 Cor. iii. 11.

What Mr. *Carlisle* defines Religion to be, namely, “an

“ hearty and warm Inclination and Endeavour to know the Will of God, and to perform it when known;” may be safely asserted and maintain'd to have been the Religion of innocent Man in Paradise, to be the Religion of Saints in the militant Church on Earth, and will be the Religion of glorify'd Saints and Angels in Heaven; only with this Difference, that in Innocence, Man's Knowledge of God's Will, and Power to perform it, was co-natural to him; here in the imperfect State both Knowledge and Power are adventitious, *i. e.* he stands in need of a Revelation, and of Illumination by the Holy Ghost, to make him savingly know what God has reveal'd, and of inward Strength of Divine Grace; to perform both which are given in Heaven constantly and in vastly higher Degrees; but still both their and our Religion consists in knowing the Will of God and performing it when known. — Thus Christ has taught us to pray, Matth. vi. 10. *Thy will be done on Earth as it is in Heaven;* which our *Westminster* Divines paraphrase thus, “ We pray that God by his Grace, would make us able and willing to know, obey, and submit to his Will in all things, as the Angels do in Heaven;” and as their State is unchangeable, this will be their Religion to Eternity. I assure you, we have no Doctrines in our Religion but what are contain'd in the revealed Will of God, no Duties but what his Word enjoins the Performance of, but I am perswaded you have some in yours; such as these following, *viz.* the Oath of Abjuration, or to abjure the Pretender as a national Sin; the Union of Scotland and England is a national Sin, with many others of the like Sort, which are contain'd in your *Act, Declaration and Testimony*; but we know of no other Foundation or Ground of Hope of Happiness when this frail and transitory Life is ended but God's precious Promises through Christ; we are sensible that our own Works, the best of them, are but a sandy Foundation; for our Hopes of future Happiness, are fix'd upon the free Mercy of God in Christ; according to the following Scriptures, Titus iii. 4, — 7. Acts iv. — 12. Phil. iii. 3, 8.

You say “ to which of the Saints will we turn? ” I suppose you mean for an Example of their placing Religion in an hearty and warm Inclination and Endeavour to know the Will of God, and to perform it when known. I answer in brief, we have the Example of all the Saints upon
our

our Side, placing Religion in this, whose Lives are recorded in the Word of God, particularly *David*, Psalm cxix. 6. *Hezekiah*, *Isai*. xxxviii. 3. *Paul*, 2 Tim. iv. 6. 8. — viii. and many others too tedious to mention.

Page the 11th of the *Survey*, you quote two unconnected Sentences, which ly a good way assunder in Mr. *Carlisle's* Sermon, the one being in Page the 11, and the other in Page the 14. and join them together, to answer a Purpose quite different from the Author's Design, in the Places from whence they are taken; you put these Sentences in the Mouth of a Member of the General Synod, in giving Directions to a poor distress'd Sinner, asking what he must do to be saved? whereas there is no such Case put, nor any such Query in the whole Sermon. At this rate of mangling an Author, any Person that would allow himself such a wicked Liberty, by taking broken and disjointed Sentences, and coupling them together; by this way of working one might make the Words of the most sensible Writer to express Nonsense, or the most pious Writer, Blasphemy; nay what dreadful Work might one make with the holy Scriptures this way? *There is no God; rejoice O young Man in thy Youth, and let thy Heart cheer thee, in the Days of thy Youth, and walk in the Way of thy Heart, and in the Sight of thine Eyes; — All Things come alike to all, there is one Event to the Righteous, and to the Wicked; to the good and to the clean, and to the unclean; to him that sacrificeth, and to him that sacrificeth not; as is the Good, so is the Sinner; and he that sweareth, as he that feareth an Oath.* Psal. 14 i. Eccles. xi. 9. and ix. 2. Would not these three Texts of Scripture, without considering the Scope and Design of the divine Penman in each of them, represent these three atheistical Doctrines? There is no supreme Being, to take an Account of us, therefore young men may safely indulge themselves in all Licentiousness with Impunity, for there is no future State of Rewards and Punishments; whereas a Person who duely considers the Scope and Design of the several Texts, finds that they have no such Meaning, but the very reverse of this; that the Words in the first Text are not properly the Belief of *David*, but the wicked Wish of the Fool's Heart, the Fool (saith *David*) hath said in his Heart, there is no God; in the 2d Text *Solomon* speaks ironically to the voluptuous young Epicure, *q. d.* never spare to gratify every of thy

thy sensual Appetites, but know this (saith he) that for all these Things God will bring into Judgment; and in the last Text the Royal Preacher is not speaking at all of the equal or promiscuous State of good and bad Men, after Death, but of God's promiscuous Dealing of the good and bad Things in this Life, to good and bad Men, that neither the Love nor Hatred of God can be known by these Things. I have quoted these three Texts to shew my Reader the vast Injustice that may be done to an Author by quoting independent Sentences and joining them together, as you have done here to Mr. *Carlisle*. The first Sentence you quote is from Page the 11th of his Sermon, where he is asserting, that it is the Right of every private Christian to be zealous in searching for Truth in the holy Scriptures, "as if (saith he) the Right of private Judgment, of every Christian's judging for himself in Matters of Religion, were not the Privilege and Duty of every Christian Man, as well as of the Clergy; or as if any Man could be ty'd up, or abso-
" solv'd by the received Rules, or authoriz'd Forms of
" Doctrine, of any Church, from his Duty and Privi-
" lege of inquiring sincerely and impartially into the Will
" of God, contain'd in the holy Scriptures." It's plain at first Sight, that Mr. *Carlisle* is here maintaining a Protestant Principle, in recommending the Study of the holy Scriptures, to our common Hearers; in Opposition to the Church of *Rome*, who deny this Liberty to the Layety, a Liberty which Christ has given the meanest of his People, *John* v. 39. *Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal Life, and they are they which testify of me.* For the Defence of which Liberty, many of our pious Reformers from *Papery*, shed their Blood. Now dare you say, in plain English, that he is wrong in asserting and maintaining this Protestant Principle? Would you have the common People debarr'd from using this Liberty? Would you have them implicitly to follow their Guides? Would you have them to pin their Faith on their Teacher's Sleeve? Do you imagine that Ignorance is the Mother of Devotion? By your accusing Mr. *Carlisle* for maintaining the above Principle, you seem to think so, and to endeavour to bring in *Papery*, notwithstanding of all you have said against it, in your Answer to Mr. *Peebles*; especially, because you accuse Mr. *Carlisle* because he condemns, in his 14th Page, the cruel and barbarous Method which the Church of *Rome* zealously

zealously pursue, in order to bring in Men to their Communion; his Words are these, "No Zeal therefore for God and his Glory, for the Church and Religion, will justify the doing of that which is morally Evil; and yet, what is more frequent than for Men, out of Zeal for God and Religion, to overlook the Evil and Unlawfulness of the Means they use, for advancing so good an End! This is that which hath sanctify'd these refin'd Arts of Wick- edness made Use of by the Church of *Rome* to this pur- pose. But the Means must be proportion'd to the End, as the End is to bring Men to the Practice of Religion; so the Means made use of to obtain that End, must be such as are agreeable to the Rules of that same Religion." Now follow his Words which you have quoted and pervert- ed. "Seeing therefore that Mildness, Meekness, Com- passion, Charity, Benevolence, and Moderation are Vir- tues indispensably required by the Christian Law, it plain- ly follows, that a Zeal to propagate and promote that Re- ligion, carried on by Anger, Uncharitableness, Callum- ny, or Cruelty, cannot be a true Zeal for that Religion, which strictly forbids the Practice of these Vices." Is it because he has represented your Friends in the Church of *Rome* in a just, tho' disagreeable Light, with regard to the Inhumanity and Cruelty which their blind Zeal prompts them to in making Profelites to their Church, that you are so angry at him? Or is it not rather, because he condemns the Methods which *Seceders* take, out of their furious and blind Zeal, to propagate their Religion, and fill their Church with Profelites, *viz.* Anger, Uncharitableness and Callum- ny? This last seems really to be the Ground of your Quarrel with him; for you seem to be for more violent Measures, for propagating *Secedism*, than he would allow for propagat- ing pure Christianity itself. If we may judge *Ex ungue Le- onem*, i. e. of the Lion by his Paw, from the Specimens you have given of the Violence of your Zeal, to encrease your Party, by your Anger, Uncharitableness, and Callumny, a- gainst those who differ from you, we may rationally judge how far your Zeal might carry you, if your Numbers and Power were increas'd. Having now given the Reader an intire View of these two above quoted Passages of Mr *Car- lisle's* Sermon, I shall next shew him, what Use you make of them; your Words are these; "Now what if a poor broken hearted Sinner, should come to you with this per-

"plexing

"Case of Conscience, and say," "Ah! Sir, I can- not but look upon my self destitute of true Religion, because I am more brutish than any Man, not having learned the Knowledge of the Holy about the Will of God, nor have I Ability to perform it if I knew it, for when I would do Good Evil is present with me; O! wretched Man that I am, what shall I do to be saved? I humbly think that in consistency with this Doctrine of your Synod, the only Answer you can return to such a perplex'd Soul is to this Purpose: Friend, the only true Religion whereupon you are to ground your Hope of Happiness, is to enquire impartially into the Mind and Will of God contained in the Scriptures" (you should have added, and perform it when known) "to exercise the Right of private Judgment, and not to be ty'd up to the Rules or authoriz'd Forms of Doctrine in any Church, to exercise Mildness, Meekness, Compassion, Charity; Benevolence, and Moderation to all Men; then you need not fear, but confidently upon this alone ground all your Hopes of Happiness hereafter. Sir, this Answer is not a Composure of mine, but borrow'd from this approv'd synodical Sermon, Page 11, 14, &c." You may just as well say that these Deists, *Tindal* and *Morgan*, have bor- row'd all the unsound and dangerous Tenets contained in their Books out of *Ainsworth's* and *Cole's* Dictionary; be- cause all the Words they use, are contain'd in said Diction- aries, tho' not at all in the Order, nor with the Design they have us'd them; and the Case is just so here. — I blush and am ashamed to publish to the World, that any Man like you of the Protestant Denomination, that ever pretended to preach the Gospel of Truth, should be guilty of so gross Perversion of a dead Man's Words, and so much abominable Falshood!

Page 12, you accuse Mr. *Carlisle* for having said, Page 18, That a partial and disproportion'd Zeal dwells on smaller Matters, and sometimes on Trifles, with the same or greater Degree of Warmth and Violence than on the most necessary Articles or Duties of Religion. Undoubtedly this Assertion is Truth, and appears so to every Person who is in the least acquainted with the History of the *British* Church. In Bishop *Laud's* Time, during the Reign of King *Charles* the First, the Men of tender Consciences suffered more severely by that Prelate's furious Zeal, for insignificant Things and

Trifles, such as the Breach of a Saint's Day, or not wearing the Canonical Vestments, than wicked Men suffered by him for the Breach of the Laws of God, *viz.* Sabbath-breaking, Drunkenness, Uncleaness, and the like. To do you Justice, you own that this is true in the Abstract; and if it be true at all, what have you to say against it? If it be true in the Abstract, how can it be false in the concrete? A thing cannot be true and false at the same time. I hope you will not betake your self to the old Nonsensical Distinction, and say, *That it is Subjectively true, but Objectively false*; if once you creep into that Jesuitical Hole, I cannot reach you, you'll be quite too subtle for me.

You say, "another Doctrine, in the second Place, commonly known by the Name *New-Light* in said Sermon, page 18. *viz.* that different Forms of Church Polity or Government, appears at first Sight to be but lesser Matters of the Law; when compar'd with Faith, Repentance and a pious Life."

Now Sir, in the most unsound Sense in which these Words can be taken, I shall shew the World, from your own Words, that you are as high a *New-light* Man as Mr. *Carlisle* himself, and own the same Doctrine which you here alledge he maintains, if you take the Words in this Sense, which seems to be the most suspicious and unsound, namely, whether a Man adheres to that Church, which is govern'd in the Presbyterian way; or whether he adheres to a Church, which is govern'd in the Independant way; or whether he adheres to that Church which is govern'd in the Episcopal way; that this is no such Matter in the Sight of God, as whether the Man be a true Penitent, a true Believer in Christ, and of a godly Life; for you yourself intirely fall in with this Doctrine, when you say page 90. "I hereby frankly own, that I comfortably hope, and charitably believe, there are pious Christians in the Protestant Churches of *Scotland, England, Germany, and America*, &c. yea among the *Independants* and *Anabaptists* in *England*, as also among the Ministers and People belonging to the General Synod of *Ulster* in *Ireland*, "which are of Christ's little Flock." Now here you own some of all these three Denominations of Church Government, *viz.* *Presbyterian, Independant, and Episcopal*, are of Christ's little Flock, and consequently are saved; but you cannot believe, nor any Man who reads the

holy

Scriptures, that any Man of what Denomination of Christians soever he be, shall be saved without true Repentance, without saving Faith in Christ, or without Holiness; because God has said the contrary, in these following Scriptures, *Luke xiii. 3. Except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish.* Mark xvi. 16. *He that believeth not shall be damned.* Heb. xii. 14. *Without Holiness no Man shall see the Lord.*

Now why do you here accuse Mr. *Carlisle* for believing and teaching, what you believe and write with your own Hand yourself? Should you not consider what the Apostle Paul says, *Rom. ii. 1. Therefore thou art inexcusable O Man, whosoever thou art, that judgest, for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thy self, for thou that judgest doest the same things.*

But there is another Meaning in the above Paragraph, of which his Words are very capable, without any Force offer'd to them; and which really from those who were acquainted with him, I take to be his real and true Meaning; that he is not to be understood to mean, that the several different Species, or Kinds of Government, *viz.* *Presbyterian, Episcopal, and Independant*, are lesser Matters of the Law; but that the various and different Forms of one and the same Presbyterian Church-Government are but lesser Matters of the Law, *i. e.* whether the General Synod of *Ulster* shall continue to meet in our usual way, *viz.* one Minister and one ruling Elder from every Congregation; or whether we shall meet in a different Form, by Delegation, as was the Custom of the Presbyterian Church of *France*, and is the Custom of the General Assembly of the Church of *Scotland*. The Reason why it is alledg'd that this is his Meaning, it is known he was for meeting by Delegation. There was a Design form'd by many considerable Members of our Synod above thirty Years ago, before *New-light* was known, that our General Synod should meet by Delegation, in Conformity with other reform'd Churches; and there has for some Years past been an Overture transmitted to the Consideration of the several Presbyteries, whether or no, it would not be Expedient, that our General Synod, for the future, should meet by Delegation.

Mr. *Stewart* tells us, in his Collection of the Discipline of the Church of *Scotland*, Page 70, "That at the Beginning

ning of the Reformation, until the Number of Ministers did increase and multiply, the Assembly was at first a General Meeting of them all; but thereafter they did im- power and commissionate a few to represent them." But he tells us Page 71, that, "Now by the fifth Act of Assembly, 1694, the Representation of the several Presbyteries in this National Church, in its General Assemblies, shall hold Proportion to the several Parishes, whether vacant or planted, in each Presbytery, in manner following; all Presbyteries consisting of twelve Parishes or under that Number, shall send two Ministers, and one ruling Elder; and all Presbyteries consisting of eighteen Parishes, or under that Number, but above twelve, shall send three Ministers and one ruling Elder; and all Presbyteries consisting of twenty-four Parishes, or under that Number, but above eighteen, shall send four Ministers, and two ruling Elders: And Lastly, all Presbyteries consisting of above twenty-four Parishes, shall send five Ministers, and two ruling Elders; and every Royal Burgh send a ruling Elder, and the Burgh of *Edinburgh* sends two, there being sixty-six Burghs, there may come from them, sixty-seven Elders, and one Elder from each of the Universities, viz. *Aberdeen, St. Andrew's, Glasgow, and Edinburgh*, which together with the Elders sixty eight, who come from the Presbyteries, makes in all One hundred and Thirty nine, and Ministers One hundred and Eighty." Every one sees here, that this is a different Form of the same Presbyterian Government, which takes place in the General Assembly, from what is in the General Synod of *Ulster*; there is not much more than a sixth Part, nor so much as a fifth Part of the Ministers in the National Church, who have a Right by their Polity or Form of Government to sit, as Members of their Assembly, and all the rest, which is the Majority, are excluded from having any Liberty to Judge, or Vote: But here, every individual Minister has Access as a Member, to judge and vote; here there may be an equal Number of Elders as of Ministers; for every Session may send one; but there it is not so, there are forty Ministers more than all the Elders that can by their Constitution, be admitted Members of the Assembly.

The Reasons moving both the *French* and the *Scottish* Church, to meet by Delegation, in their national Assemblies,
was

was probably, the vast Extent of the Bounds of their Church; if every Minister had attended, it would have been a vast Fatigue and Toil to far distant Members, have expos'd them to great Expences, and which is worst of all, have left their Churches for a long Time, without Sermon. Here in *Ireland* we are under no such Inconveniencies, our Bounds being but small, the Members all (save a very few) live within this Province, but tho' we should change from our present Way, and meet by Delegation, our Form of Government would not be the same, but the Government itself would be presbyterial still, as well as that of the Church of *France* or *Scotland*; and who durst say, that this Change was as great a Matter of the Law of God as Faith, Repentance, or an holy Life? In a Word, he was for the Delegations taking place in the Synod, but he was unwilling that any Ministers should carry their Zeal for, or against it so far, as to break the Peace of this Church, or create any Schism or Division. Our taking the Words in this last Sense (which appears to be Mr. *Carlisle's* Meaning) take quite away the Force of all the Objections you make. As first, you say, Page 14, "This is no less than in an oblique Manner, to accuse these Martyrs (namely the *Scottish* Sufferers, the old *Covenanters*) those religious Dead, with the horrid Crime of Self-murder, and casting away their precious and useful Lives for Trifles; *Died Abner as a Fool?* Is this a mannerly or charitable way of treating their valuable Memory?" To which I reply, The Cause of their Suffering was not at all for the Form of our Church Government, but for the Substance of it, not whether the General Assembly should meet by Delegation, as they do now, or whether they should meet as our General Synod do; they would have been satisfy'd with either of these Forms; this was not at all the Case; but the Case in truth was this; whether they would abjure the Substance of presbyterial Government, and submit to the Hierarchy, and embrace Episcopal Government; it was for this they shed their Blood; they died Martyrs in a good Cause, and their Memories are always favourable to us, and Mr. *Carlisle* has said nothing against them, nor yet against King *William*, as you falsely alledge. We are always thankful to God for raising up so great a Deliverer; when these Lands were apparently upon the brink of Ruin, he saved us from *Popery* and *Slavery*, and lawless arbitrary Power, establish'd the Substance of

For the following Sophism is just as conclusive as your Argument. A British Shilling bears King *George's* Image, is for his Honour, and the Good of his Subjects; a Guinea also bears King *George's* Image, is for his Honour, and the Good of his Subjects; therefore a Shilling and a Guinea are just of the same intrinsic Worth and Value. If you ow'd a Man ten Guineas, and offer'd him ten Shillings in lieu of the former, urging him to take them in full Payment, would not he reckon you either a Knave or a Fool? And certainly they must be a stupid Race of Mankind, of the lowest Understandings, upon whom such Arguments, or rather Sophisms, as you frequently use thro' your Book, can prevail upon to believe you. You conclude this Charge with these Words, "What Subject in his Kingdom could be deem'd truly loyal hearted, to sit still "supinely negligent, and hearing such Language, and seeing such Papers pass'd against his Divine Government "without remonstrating and giving the Alarm?" To which I reply, If Mr. *Carlisse's* Words in the contested Paragraph be taken in the most suspicious Sense, in which they can, I have sufficiently proven you to be equally guilty from your own Words, Page of the *Survey* go; and if they be taken in the last Sense which I gave of them, which I verily believe was his Meaning, then they are lyable to no Objection; for there is nothing in them that in the least detracts from the kingly Authority of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. We firmly believe the Substance of presbyterial Government the only authoriz'd Church Government in the New Testament, but as to the form of exercising this Government, in our supreme Judicatories, the Scripture has left us at Liberty to chuse which way will best answer the general Good of the Church and Conveniency of its Officers; whether to meet by Delegation, or otherwise: So that you are without Cause in a Panick, as the Psalmist says of the Wicked, *Psal. liii. 5. There were they in great Fear, where no Fear was.* You would have consulted your own Credit much better, had you observ'd what *Solomon* says, *Prov. xvii. 27. He that is wise spareth Words,* ver. 28. *Even a Fool when he holdeth his peace, is accounted wise; and he that shutteth his Lips is esteem'd a Man of Understanding.*

Page the 15th, you say, "In the third Place, therefore to Consideration another *New-light* Doctrine, viz. "Page 18 of this Sermon,—That different Creeds and on-

"sessions,

"sessions, human Schemes of Divine Truth, appear at first "Sight, to be but lesser Matters of the Law, when compar'd with Faith, Repentance, and a pious Life. Then "at the End of the same Paragraph they are call'd, this Tyth "of *Mint, Annise and Cummin.*" You say, "as Church "Government in the last notic'd Expression, was set first "in the Synod's Roll of Trifles, so now different Creeds "and Confessions are set next in the said Roll." To which last Words I reply, You assert here two gross Non-truths, and have broken the Law of the great God, in bearing false Witness against your Neighbour, for he has no where in the whole Sermon, in the aforesaid Sentence, nor any where else, put either Church Government, or Creeds or Confessions in either the first or last Roll of Trifles: He does not call them, or compare them to Trifles at all; nay does not call them little Things in themselves, he calls them indeed lesser Matters of the Law, when compar'd with Faith, Repentance and a pious Life. The Word Trifles is not within two Lines of the Sentence you quote, but in the third Line above it, and a full Punctum between that Sentence and this one.

You remember, Page 12, you quoted this Sentence, where he says, that "a partial and disproportionate Zeal dwells "on smaller Matters, and sometimes on Trifles, with the "same or greater Degree of Warmth and Violence as on "the most necessary Articles and Duties of Religion;" which you own'd yourself was true in the Abstract; but I now tell you expressly what he meant by these Words, and what he particularly understood by these Trifles, namely, that Difference about observing *Easter*, &c. upon which the *Western* and *Eastern* Churches divided and excommunicated one another. This happened in the 4th Century, and for many Centuries divided them, as *Bede*, *Du Pine*, *Petrie*, and almost all Ecclesiastick Historians take notice of it. The particular Difference was thus, the *Latin* Church, in Remembrance of Christ's Resurrection, did observe *Easter* the first Sabbath after the Full Moon of *March*; the *Eastern* or *Greek* Church kept for *Easter* the 14th Day of the Moon, on whatsoever Day of the Week it fell. Now was not this a very Trifle, for one Church to excommunicate another, in the Judgment of us who are Presbyterians, especially when we cannot find in the New Testament any Precept for observing it at all, or any Day, except the Christian Sabbath?

Having

Having now shewn that these Trifles have only relation to *Easter* and other holy Days not commanded in the Word of God, but not at all to Church Polity, Creeds or Confessions, I come now to consider these Words, "that different Creeds and Confessions, human Schemes of Divine Truth, &c." which you alledge contain dreadful New-light Doctrine; and to shew you, and my other Readers, that they contain no such Thing, but on the contrary, wholesome and sound Doctrine according to Godliness; profess'd and practis'd by many of our godly Reformers in the several Protestant reformed Churches, long before modern New-light had a Being or was ever heard of in the World. I would first define the Terms;

x/, By Creed is commonly meant a brief Summary of the chief Principles necessary to be believed by a Christian, in order to Salvation, collected out of the holy Scriptures, and perfectly agreeable to the same.

2dly, A larger Summary not only of those Truths, but also of those Things that are to be practis'd, is called a Confession.

3dly, By Scheme is usually meant any Draught or Plan wherein Things are laid down, in Method and Order.

4thly, By human Schemes, are meant such a Draught or Plan laid down by Men.

And *lastly*, By Divine Truths, are meant those that are revealed by God.

Now I would remark here; that it is not the Divine Truths themselves, contain'd in different Creeds and Confessions, that he meant to be lesser Matters of the Law, when compar'd with Faith, Repentance, and a pious Life; for these very Things, *viz.* Faith, Repentance, and a pious Life, are contain'd in our Creeds and Confessions, and are a principal and necessary Part of them; for this would be to compare at the same time, the same Things with themselves; and to reckon them at the same time, both greater Matters of the Law, and lesser Matters of the Law, which is a flat Contradiction. His Meaning then, must be, not that these Divine Truths themselves, in our Creeds and Confessions, are lesser Matters of the Law, but the human Schemes, Draughts, or Plans in which these Truths are express'd or laid down; that provided the Divine Truths be the same in several Creeds and Confessions, it is not a Matter of so very great Importance, tho' the Plan in which these Truths are laid

laid down, being human, be different. Thus it is with respect to these Creeds, that are commonly call'd, the *Apostles*, the *Nicean* and the *Athenasian*; the Truths are Divine and substantially the same in each; but the Scheme, Draught, or Plan, being human, is in all the three different. Thus it is also with respect to these three Confessions of Faith, our *Westminster*, the *Scots*, and the *French* Confession; the Divine Truths are substantially the same in each, yet the Plan or Scheme in which these Truths are laid down in each is different one from another.

And his Meaning is, that one Protestant Church who subscribe to one of those Creeds, and Confessions, for Instance, the *Apostle's*, and the *Westminster*, ought not to despise, or be zealous against their Protestant Brethren in any two other Sister-churches, who subscribe and adhere to these other two Creeds and Confessions; seeing all the three profess the same Divine Truths; it is not a matter of such Importance, tho' the human Plan, or Scheme in which these Truths are express'd be different in all the three. The *Scotts* Confession which was formed in the Year 1560, consisting of XXVI Chapters, we have printed in the Rev'd Mr. *Calderwood's* Church History, from Page the 14th to Page 24th. And the *French*, consisting of XL Articles, we have printed in the first Volume of the Rev'd Mr. *John Quick's* *Synodicon*, from Page 6th to 16th. This Confession was form'd at first by the venerable, learned, judicious and pious Mr. *John Calvine*, the great Reformer. This Confession was received by the Church of *France*, in their first national Synod, held in the City of *Paris* in the Year of our Lord 1559; for both which Confessions I have a great Esteem and Regard, as being so consonant and agreeable to our own *Westminster* one.

I shall now shew my Reader from many Instances, that our first godly Reformers, in the several Protestant Churches of *Europe*, acted exactly agreeably to what Mr. *Carlisle* says in the above quarrell'd Expression, by shewing no Zeal against one another, but the greatest Love and Harmony, in mutually subscribing one another's Confessions of Faith, where the Divine Truths were the same, tho' the Schemes or Plans in which these Truths were laid down, being human, were various and different one from another: I shall give several Instances of this, first in particular Persons, and then of whole Churches.

The first I shall mention, is the holy Mr. *John Welsh*, who is reported to have spent eight Hours every Day in Prayer; who had been Minister of *Air*, a Member of the General Assembly, and consequently had subscrib'd the old *Scots* Confession, which obtain'd in that Church before the *Westminster* was compil'd; yet we find him a Member of the General Synod of *Gap*, and subscribing the *French* Confession in the Year 1603, when he became Pastor of a *French* Church called *St. Jean D'Angly*. See *Quick's Synodicon* Vol. I. Page 254. From the same Author I could produce the Names of many eminent and worthy *Scots* Divines, acting the same Part with respect to the *French* Confession; such as Messrs. *George Elliot*, *George Thomson*, *Primerose*, &c.

I shall next quote the Practice of whole Churches, acting the same Part, viz. of *France* and *Holland*, mutually subscribing one another's different Confessions, and I shall give you the History of it, in the Words of the same Rev'd Author, Page 143, "Our Brethren of the *Low-Countries* having requested, that some good Course might be taken, and Means us'd that the Deputies of their Churches might for time to come, be present at our national Synods, and ours at theirs,——and whereas the Brethren, their Deputies, have tendered to this Synod (i.e. at *Vitrea* 1583) the Confession of Faith, and Body of Church-Discipline, own'd and embrac'd by the said Churches of the *Low-Countries*; this Assembly having heartily blest'd God for that sweet Union and Agreement, both in Doctrine and Discipline, between the Churches of this Kingdom and of that *Republick*, did judge meet to subscribe them both, and it did also request those our Brethren, their Deputies reciprocally, to subscribe our Confession of Faith, and Body of Discipline; which in Obedience to the Commission given them by their Principals, they did accordingly; thereby testifying that mutual Harmony and Agreement in the Doctrine and Discipline of all the Churches in both Nations——"

I shall lastly take Notice of the whole Church of *Scotland*, who had all subscrib'd the old *Scots* Confession; but no sooner is the *Westminster* Confession form'd in *England*, and by Commissioners brought, but immediately after a due refusal, they subscrib'd it as the Confession of their national Church; as they say in their Act approving of it, at *Edinburgh*,

burgh, August 29th, 1647: They find it to be most agreeable to the Word of God, i.e. the Truths contain'd in it are Divine, tho' they could not but perceive that the human Scheme or Plan, in which these Divine Truths were laid down in both the old *Scots* Confession, and it, were different from one another. But this Difference, seeing the Divine Truths in both were the same, they justly reckon'd but (as Mr. *Carlisle* says) a lesser Matter of the Law.

Having now seen so many eminent godly Divines, yea so many sound Protestant Churches, acting up exactly to what Mr. *Carlisle* asserts in the foregoing Proposition, is it not unsufferably bold and arrogant (nay may not I venture to say, impudent) in you, being so young a Divine, to condemn, thro' Mr. *Carlisle*, their Practice and Conduct? Is not this (as you say elsewhere) an affronting the precious Memory of the religious Dead?

You tell us, Page 15th, "then by the very same Parity of Reason, your, and your Synod's Sermons in general, and this synodical Sermon in particular, being but human Schemes, ought to be valued only as this Tyth of Mint, Annise and Cummin; yet whoever would pass such a Sentence upon them, would not readily escape being reckon'd by you Contemners, malevolent and uncharitable Callumniators;" To which I reply, Not at all; the Person that would call our Sermons such, would not be in the least Danger of those hard Names from us; for we really look upon the best Sermons that ever we preach'd, to be no more but human Schemes of Divine Truths; whatever you may think of yours, and your Party's: Perhaps you look upon them to be divine Schemes of Divine Truths; but to call any Sermons, compos'd by uninspir'd Men, since the Death of the holy Apostles of our Lord, divine Schemes of divine Truths, amounts, in our Judgment, to Nonsense, and shews the Person that calls them so grossly ignorant of what is Human and what is Divine; and points out *Bedlam* a fitter Place for him than a Pulpit.

You add, "there is not so much Truth to be found in these their human Schemes as in this Confession." I reply, All this is true; there is not so much Truth, or so many Truths in the longest Sermon that ever any of us compos'd, or in the longest that you or any of your Party ever deliver'd, or ever will at one time, unless you repeat the Confession it self for a Sermon. But what is all you say here

to the Purpose?—You add, “Which they treat so disrespectfully,” we flatly deny, that Mr. *Carlisle* treated it disrespectfully; he own'd the Truths contained in it to be Divine, though the Scheme or Plan in which they are laid down be Human: And can you, Sir, in plain English contradict him in this, and say, that the Scheme, as well as the Truths contained in it, are Divine also, *i. e.* that God himself, and not Men, made the Confession in Form, and delivered it to the venerable Assembly at *Westminster*, as the Law was delivered to *Moses* at *Sinai*? If this be your Meaning, I speak it out, and plainly tell the World so.

Page 16 you tell us, “That no less than an hundred pious and learned English Divines, who by an Ordinance of that Parliament, together with five Ministers, and three Lords ruling Elders, by Appointment of the Church of *Scotland*, conven'd in King *Henry* the Seventh's Chapel at *Westminster*, upon the first of *July*, being *Saturday*, 1643, and sat until *February* 22d, 1649, which was five Years, six Months, and twenty two Days, spent by them in studying and composing that Confession.” This Account you give of the venerable *Westminster* Assembly is so time and imperfect, false and inconsistent with Truth, and even contradictory to itself, that one is surpriz'd that you are no better acquainted with the History of that Affair.

I shall give a brief and true Account of the Number, principal Business, and Time of Sitting of that venerable Assembly, from *Neal's History of the Puritans*, Vol. 3d, Page 52, &c. “There were (says he) an hundred and twenty one English Divines, and thirty Lay-Affessors, appointed by the Parliament, to meet the first of *July*, in King *Henry* the Seventh's Chapel; and seventeen Divines were afterwards superadded, to keep up the Number of those who died, or were incapacitated to attend, during the sitting of the Assembly.

“To each of the Divines the Parliament allowed four Shillings per Day, for their Support, which to one hundred and twenty one, amounted to twenty four Pounds and four Shillings per Day, or eight thousand eight hundred and thirty three Pounds per Year. Of the English Laymen, ten were Peers, and twenty Commons of Parliament: Of the Peers six were Earls, and four Lords, of which *Edward* Lord Viscount *Conway* was one.

“Of the Commons, seven were Knights, of which Sir *John* *Cotworthy* was one, of whom by the female Line the Right Honourable Lord *Maffareen* is descended. Dr. *William Twiss* opened the Assembly by Preaching and Prayer, and was appointed Proloquitur; to whom Mr. *Charles Herlie* succeeded.

“The Lay-Affessors had an equal Liberty of debating and voting with the Divines.

“Every Member before his Admission, took the following Vow or Protestation, *viz.* I do seriously and solemnly in the Presence of Almighty God declare, That in this Assembly whereof I am a Member, I will not maintain any Thing in Matter of Doctrine, but what I believe in my Conscience, to be most agreeable to the Word of God, or in point of Discipline, but what I shall conceive to conduce most to the Glory of God, and the Good and Peace of his Church: And to refresh their Memories, this was read in the Assembly every *Monday* Morning.

“The first Thing they took in Hand was, to consider what Amendments were proper to be made in the doctrinal Articles of the Church of *England*, and spent ten Weeks in debating upon the first fifteen, before the Arrival of the *Scottish* Commissioners: Their Design was, to render them more express and determinate in favour of *Calvinism*, and equally to guard them against *Arminianism* on the one Hand, and *Antinomianism* on the other.

“The Parliament had sent Commissioners to the General Assembly, to request the Assistance of the *Scots*; and to invite them to send their Commissioners to sit in the *Westminster* Assembly.

“The English Commissioners arrived at *Edinburgh* August the 2d, and were favourably receiv'd by the Assembly, who proposed as a Preliminary; That the two Nations should enter into a perpetual Covenant, for themselves and their Posterity, that all things might be done in God's House, according to his Will: And that if *England* will come into this, they will unanimously advise the Convention of States of *Scotland*, to assist the Parliament of *England* with Forces in their present War. Accordingly the Solemn League and Covenant is drawn up, read and approved of in Assembly at *Edinburgh*.

" burgh August 17, 1643, and Commissioners appointed
 " to sit in the *Westminster* Assembly, and Instructions given
 " them.

" The Commissioners were three Noblemen and five
 " Divines, viz. Lord *Maitland*, afterwards Duke of *Lau-*
 " *derdale*, Earl of *Lothian*, or *Cassils*, (as the Act of As-
 " sembly has it) and Sir *Archibald Johnston*, commonly
 " called Lord *Warriston*, the Rev'd Messieurs *Alexander*
 " *Henderson*, *George C. Lespy*, *Samuel Rutherford*, *Ro-*
 " *bert Baily*, and *Robert Douglas*: But though he was
 " Commission'd, I don't find him in the List with the o-
 " ther four Brethren who attended the Assembly; Sickness
 " or some insuperable Difficulty had prevented him.
 " Their Instructions were to promote the Extirpation of
 " *Popery*, *Prelacy*, *Heresy*, *Schism*, *Scpticism*, and *I-*
 " *colatry*; and to endeavour an Union between the two
 " Kingdoms in one Confession of Faith, one Form of
 " Church Government, and one Directory of Worship.
 " When the *Scottish* Commissioners arrived at *Westminster*
 " in *September*, and presented the Covenant to the As-
 " sembly, they took their Seats; and *Monday*, being the
 " 25th of *September*, was appointed to have it subscrib'd
 " and sworn to; which was accordingly done, both by
 " the Lords, the Members of the Assembly, and by the
 " Commons.

" The Divines who were most Episcopally inclin'd took it
 " not, but withdrew, except Doctor *Featly*. After the
 " *Scotts* Commissioners came, the Assembly laid aside the
 " Thoughts of the Thirty-nine Articles. And the Co-
 " venant being sworn, they next resolved to form a Di-
 " rectory, *October* the 17, 1643, and finish'd it, and esta-
 " blish'd it by an Order of Parliament, *January* 3d,
 " 1645.

" Then they began to compile the Directory for Ordi-
 " nation of Ministers, and for Presbyterian Church Go-
 " vernment: This took up a great deal of Time; by
 " reason of the Opposition it met with, both from *Era-*
 " *stians* and *Independents*. However it was finished, and
 " pass'd into an Ordinance of Parliament *November* 5,
 " 1645.

" The Assembly took under their Consideration, Mr.
 " *Francis Rouse's* Translation of the *Psalms*; after se-
 " veral Amendments made, they sent it to the Parlia-
 " ment;

" ment; and an Act pass'd for the Use of it in all Church-
 " es, *November* 14, 1645.

" It was also approv'd of by the Commission of the
 " General Assembly of the Church of *Scotland* at *Edin-*
 " *burgh*, *November* 23d, 1649. and by the Committee
 " of Estates at *Edinburgh*, *January* 8, 1650. This is
 " the same Paraphrase of the *Psalms* in Meeter, which we
 " now use; its Author was *Francis Rouse* Esq; a Mem-
 " ber of the English Parliament, and also a Member of
 " the *Westminster* Assembly.

" The English Divines were for revising and explain-
 " ing the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of *England*;
 " but the *Scotts* insisted on having a System of their own.
 " A Committee was therefore appointed, to prepare Ma-
 " terials for this Purpose, *May* 9th, 1545. Their Names
 " were Dr. *Gorge*, Dr. *Hoyle*, Messrs. *Gataker*, *Tuckny*,
 " *Reynolds* and *Vines*, with the *Scotts* Divines: Who
 " having settled the Titles of the several Chapters, dis-
 " tributed them for greater Expedition, among several
 " Sub-committees, which sat two Days every Week; and
 " then reported what they had finished to the Commit-
 " tee, and so to the Assembly, where it was debated
 " Paragraph by Paragraph.

" The Dispute about Discipline occasion'd so many In-
 " terruptions, that it was a Year and a half before the Work
 " was finished, viz. *November* 26, 1646.

" It was presented to the Parliament *December* 11th,
 " 1646, who voted the Assembly Thanks; and desired
 " them to insert the Proofs in their proper Places, and
 " then to print six hundred Copies and no more, for the
 " perusal of the two Houses. Messieurs *Wilson* and *By-*
 " *field* were appointed to collect the Scriptures, for Con-
 " firmation of the several Articles. After this the whole
 " was committed once more to the Review of the three
 " Committees, who made Report to the Assembly of such
 " farther Amendments as they thought necessary; which
 " being agreed to by the House, it was sent to the Press,
 " *May* 11, 1647. It was received by the General Assem-
 " bly of *Scotland*, and subscrib'd as the Confession of their
 " National Church, *August* 27th, 1647, as appears by
 " their Act.

" While the Confession was carrying on through the
 " Assembly, Committees were appointed to reduce it to
 " the

“ the Form of a Larger and Shorter Catechism. The Shorter
 “ was drawn up by the Rev'd Mr. *Newcomen*, Dr. *Ar-*
ronsmith, and Dr. *Tuckny*, and by the Assembly pre-
 “ sented to be approv'd of by the House of Commons,
 “ *November* 5th 1647; but the Larger by reason of the
 “ marginal Proofs from Scripture, which the House de-
 “ sired might be inserted, was not ready till the 14th of
 “ *April* 1648. Mr. *Rutherford* moved, *October* 14th,
 “ 1647, and desired that it might be recorded in the Scribes
 “ Books, that he and his Fellow Commissioners from *Scot-*
land, had attended all the Time they had been debating,
 “ and perfecting these four Things mentioned in the Cove-
 “ nant; a Directory for Publick Worship, an uniform
 “ Confession of Faith, a Form of Church-government and
 “ Discipline, and a Publick Catechism. About a Week af-
 “ ter he, and the rest of the Commissioners took their Leave,
 “ and returned Home. After the Scots Commissioners were
 “ gone, and the Larger Catechism approved of *April* 14th,
 “ 1648, there was but a few of the English Members stay'd,
 “ who lived in or nigh the Cities of *London* and *Westmin-*
ster, (the publick principal Work being all finish'd for
 “ which they met) those who remained were employ'd by
 “ the Parliament, to examine Candidates for the holy Mi-
 “ nistry, as there was now a great Necessity to fill those
 “ Places, which were become vacant by the Episcopal be-
 “ ing cast out of many Churches.”

From your Account of the *Westminster* Assembly, com-
 pared with this brief Relation I have given of it from an
 approved Historian, the Reader will readily make the fol-
 lowing Remarks.

1st, That you have very falsly given the Number of the
 English Members; you suppress 21 of the Divines who were
 first appointed, as also the 17 who were superadded, and
 likewise the 30 Lay-assessors, *viz.* the 10 Lords, and 20
 Commons.

2^d, You have reckon'd the Time of their Sitting wrong,
 even according to the Account you gave of it your self;
viz. from *July* 1st 1643, to *Feb.* 2^d 1649; which you say
 was 5 Years, 6 Months, and 22 Days; whereas between
 these two there are 5 Years, 7 Months, and 22 Days;
 so here you are a Month wrong, even according to the
 Scotch Computation, reckoning the Beginning of the

Year

Year from the first of *January*; and according to the Eng-
 lish, who began the Year at the 25th of *March*, you are
 13 Months wrong, and inconsistent with your self.

3^d, The Confession of Faith it self was begun *May* 9th,
 1645; and finish'd, approved, and sent to the Presb, *May*
 11th, 1647; so that the *Westminster* Assembly were em-
 ploy'd about it two Years and two Days, and no more nor no
 less. In a Word, our excellent *Westminster* Confession,
 which has stood the Tryal of all its Adversaries, for the
 Space of an hundred and seven Years, and I hope will, till
 Time give place to Eternity, stands in no Need of pious
 Fraud, and false Assertions, to procure it more Regard, from
 a Consideration of the Length of Time taken up in its Com-
 posure; it speaks for itself; its perfect Consistency with
 itself, its Agreement in Substantials, with the best Con-
 fessions of the other Reformed Churches, and its universal
 Harmony with the Holy Scriptures, the Divine Spring from
 whence it was drawn, manifestly shew that it is not a pre-
 mature or hasty Birth, but on the contrary, was a Work of
 due Deliberation, great Judgment, and profound Study.
 But after all, what need one tell lies about it? We have the
 Characters of its venerable Authors, from Mr. *Baxter*, in
 these Words; “ that they were Men of eminent Learning,
 “ Godliness, ministerial Abilities, and great Fidelity; tho'
 “ he was not a Member himself, he was personally acquaint-
 “ ed with many of them.”

Page 19th, you say, “ There offers to Consideration,
 “ Page 31 of said Sermon, another *New-Light* Doctrine;
 “ *viz.* I think I may venture without Offence to any Man,
 “ to say of Subscription, which is only an Appointment of
 “ Man, what the Apostle said of Circumcision, which was
 “ an Ordinance of God, Circumcision (saith he) availeth
 “ nothing, and Uncircumcision availeth nothing, but Faith
 “ which worketh by Love. — So may I say, Subscription
 “ is nothing, and Nonsubscription is nothing, but a virtuous
 “ Life.”

I observe here according to your usual Custom, you have
 quoted your Author very unjustly; for he says, but a holy
 and virtuous Life; you suppress the Word *holy*, which in-
 cludes Piety toward God, and represent him as only saying
 a virtuous Life; which when understood, in Contradistinction
 to Holiness, signifies only our Duty toward Man. I
 can't tell what was your Design in this Omission, in false
 Wit-

Witness-bearing against your Neighbour, if it was not to represent him as asserting, that benevolent and virtuous Actions toward Men was the whole of Religion.

I shall transcribe the whole Paragraph, that the World may not be impos'd upon by your false Quotation.

"I think I may venture without Offence to any Man, to say of Subscription, which is only an Ordinance of Man, (and has in a great Measure been the Matter of our unhappy Debates) what the Apostle *Paul* said of Circumcision, which was an Ordinance of God; *Circumcision* (says he) *availeth nothing, and Uncircumcision availeth nothing, but Faith which worketh by Love*; or as he elsewhere expresseth it, *but keeping the Commands of God*: So may I say, Subscription is nothing, and Non-subscription is nothing, but a holy and virtuous Life; for the Minister that lives soberly, righteously and godly, preaches well, and is found in the Faith, is accepted of God, and justly esteem'd by all Men, whether he subscribe or not; and without these good Qualities every thing else signifies just nothing."

I must own, I was offended when I heard this Paragraph of the Sermon delivered in the Synod, particularly when he uttered what is in the Parenthesis, that Subscription has been in a great Measure the Matter of our unhappy Debates; for I apprehended he had said, it was the Cause of our unhappy Debates; but when I heard him read over the Paragraph next Day, I found I had through wrong Hearing, mistaken his Meaning: For certainly, between a Matter and Cause, there is a wide Difference. He did not say, that Subscription had been the Cause of our unhappy Debates; but only, the Matter of them. The best of Things (we all know) have been, and may be, the subject Matter of Debates; but it is only a thing evil in itself that can be the Cause of them. As the Apostle *James* saith iv. chap. 1st ver. *From whence come Wars and Fightings? come they not hence, even of your Lusts?* Our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and the precious Truths of the Gospel, were undoubtedly the subject Matter of Debates, between the primitive Christians, and the unconverted *Jews* and *Gentiles*; but it was the Ignorance, Malice, Unbelief, and Corruption of the Hearts of the latter, which was the proper Cause of their Debates with the former: And it cannot be deny'd, that the subject Matter of our unhappy Debates in the Year 1721, and

ever since, was Subscription; but it was not the Cause of them.

You say, Page 24th, "the Synod is satisfy'd that it, *i. e.* Subscription, be blamed as the Matter of their unhappy Debates, that is, an Engine of Discord and Division." I reply, that this is a direct Falshood, he never blam'd it as the Matter of our Debates, and if he had, the Synod would have very justly blam'd and censur'd him for doing so. You say "they are satisfied that it be blam'd as an Engine of Discord and Division." I reply again, this is another gross Falshood of your own making; and I desire the *Father of Lies* himself, to assert a greater: Where has Mr. *Carlisle* in his whole Sermon, call'd Subscription an Engine of Discord and Division? or where have the General Synod declared themselves satisfied, that it be blam'd as an Engine of Discord and Division? Shew me this one Thing, and I'll give up the whole Cause.

An Engine is a mechanical Word, and signifies a certain Machine, purposely formed for a certain End, to do a certain Work: Now, has either Mr. *Carlisle* in his Sermon, or the Synod, said that Subscription was form'd with this View and Design to create Discord and Division in the Church? If you cannot, you must from henceforth be blamed as a malicious Calumniator, and a notorious false Witness bearer against your Neighbour.

I come now to shew my Reader, notwithstanding all the Bustle you make about what Mr. *Carlisle* has said, in the above-contested Paragraph; that you are as great, or as much a New-light Man as he: For have not you said, Page 90, "I frankly own that I comfortably hope, and charitably believe, that there are pious Christians in the Protestant Churches of *Scotland, England, Germany, America*, &c. yea among the *Independents* and *Anabaptists* in *England*, yea among the Ministers and People of the General Synod of *ULSTER* in *Ireland*, which are of Christ's little Flock; and altho' the People of these several Persuasions differ from me, yet I desire still to maintain a charitable Regard for them?" Now don't you here publicly own, that Subscription in your Judgment is nothing, and Non-subscription is nothing, but a holy and virtuous Life, or Faith which worketh by Love? For it is observable that the Church of *Scotland*, and the General Synod of *Ulster*, subscribe the *Westminster-Confession*

fession of Faith, and the Independents and Anabaptists in England, are Non-subscribers. You here assert that you "still desire to have a charitable Regard for them;" *i. e.* some of the Church of Scotland, some Independents, some Anabaptists, and some Ministers and People of the Synod of Ulster. Neither Subscription nor Non-subscription, can be the Ground of this Regard and Esteem, seeing that some of them are Subscribers and some not, but some other thing; and you tell us particularly, what is the Ground of your Regard, *viz.* Because they are pious Christians, because they are of Christ's little Flock. That is just as Mr. *Carlisle* has express'd, upon account of their holy and virtuous Lives, or their keeping the Commands of God, or on account of the apparent Fruits of their Faith working by Love.

But perhaps it will be objected here, that you say in the following Words, that "it's not the Work of Grace that 'it's charitably hoped God has wrought in their Hearts; 'but the Words of Command which God hath revealed to 'us in the Scripture, that I am bound to take for the only 'Rule of my Behaviour towards them in Points of religious Communion." I answer, this is very true; but at the same time it is as true that Mr. *Carlisle* in the aforesaid Paragraph is neither exhorting Ministers, nor private Christians of the subscribing Party, to keep Communion with Non-subscribers: He is not speaking in these Words to his Brethren, and telling them, that notwithstanding the Presbytery of *Antrim* don't subscribe, yet they ought to keep up ministerial Communion with them: Nay, far from it, for when he is making an Application of his Doctrine, to his Brethren in the Synod, Page 29, he says, "It is not 'my Business to enter upon the Justification or Condemnation of either Party," *i. e.* He will leave the Matter as it was determined at *Dungannon*, when the Exclusion of the Non-subscribers was voted: Neither is he to be understood in the aforesaid Place, as giving Directions to a vacant Congregation in the Choice of a Minister, nor telling them, that it is equal whether he be a Subscriber or a Non-subscriber, that they choose for their Pastor. Not at all, but he is immediately addressing himself to the Elders and People, that attend on our Ministry, and diswading them from suffering the Party Names of NEW-LIGHT or OLD to enslave their Minds with Uncharitableness, Ill-will, or Hatred, against

gainst the Person of any Man. (And has not Christ carried this higher, when he teacheth us to love our Enemies?) He exhorts the Elders and People, to esteem Men on account of their Faith working by Love, their keeping the Commands of God, or their holy and virtuous Lives, whether they were Subscribers or not; neither is he here desiring either the Elders or People who belong to subscribing Ministers, to desert their Pastors and to join to the non-subscribing Ministers: But he is only exhorting them to behave to such with a right and charitable Frame of Spirit, without Hatred or Malice against the Persons of such: Just as you say you do, Page 90, with respect to the nonsubscribing Independents and Anabaptists, "ardently loving whatsoever 'you see amiable about them, even tho' you differ in some 'Things from them," *viz.* in Subscription for one Thing. Now how uncharitable is it in you, to condemn Mr. *Carlisle*, and all the Members of the General Synod for what you do your self? *Rom. ii. 1.*

I shall now lastly, consider the Words themselves; and plainly shew my Readers that they contain no *New-light* Doctrine, but on the contrary a *Doctrine according to Godliness*, which every real Christian of whatsoever Denomination must readily consent to.

Subscription is nothing, and Nonsubscription is nothing, but a holy and virtuous Life, *i. e.* Subscription without a holy and virtuous Life is nothing, or signifies nothing to procure the Person the Esteem of Men, or the Acceptance of God.

And Nonsubscription without Holiness signifies just as little: That there is not the least Force or Violence done to Mr. *Carlisle's* Words in this plain Paraphrase of them, appears from the following Reasons.

1st. It is confessed by all, that in our English Tongue, and even in the Scottish Dialect of it, the Conjunction or Particle *but* signifies *without*.

2dly. The Word *but* signifies *without*, in all those Scriptures to which he alludes, namely, *1 Cor. vii. 19. Circumcision is nothing, and Uncircumcision is nothing, BUT, or WITHOUT the keeping of the Commandments of God. Gal. v. 6. For in Christ Jesus neither Circumcision availeth any thing, nor Uncircumcision, BUT or WITHOUT Faith which worketh by Love.*

3dly. The Word *but*, not only may, but must be taken to signify *without*, because in the Amplification of the Proposition he takes it so. In the End of the same Sentence

says he, "and without these good Qualities every thing else signifies just nothing."

What has he said now in Substance but this? That neither Subscription nor Nonsubscription will stand in stead of a Man of saving and justifying Faith, or Holiness of Life, which is its genuine Fruits. If you will venture to say, that either Subscription or Nonsubscription will stand in stead of saving Faith, or the Fruits of it, a holy and virtuous Life; I dare say you are the first Man that ever said so.

Neither is this way of speaking of Mr. *Carlisle's* without Precedents in the sacred Scriptures, see 1 *Cor.* xiii. 1—3. Where the Apostle tells us, That tho' he had all these miraculous and extraordinary Gifts of the Holy Ghost, without the saving Grace of Love to God, all these would profit him nothing, or signify just nothing to him, he would undoubtedly perish if he had not a sincere Love to God and Men, flowing and proceeding from a saving and justifying Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, all these things, *viz.* the miraculous and extraordinary Gifts of Tongues, that of Prophecy, the Faith of Miracles, the giving of all his Goods to feed the Poor, and his Body to the Flames, none of all these, nor all these taken together, would stand in stead, or make up the want of Charity to him. I would ask you here, would it not be treating the Apostle very ill, nay even blaspheming the Holy Ghost by whom these Gifts were given, to say, that they are in themselves nothing, and profited the Church of Christ nothing, because he says that they profit the Man possess'd of them nothing without Charity? and the Parallel is very natural. It is very unjust in you to alledge, that Mr. *Carlisle* degrades Subscription just to nothing at all, to any other valuable End and Purpose, because he says it will not stand in stead of a holy and virtuous Life; because a late Divine has said, "Let our Opinions be never so orthodox, and our Zeal in maintaining them never so fervent, let our Prayers be never so frequent, and all our Discourses ravishing, let our other Attainments be never so great, and our Confidence of our Salvation never so strong; yet if we refuse to obey Christ in this Precept, *Mat. v. 44. Love your Enemies, we are none of Christ's Disciples.*" All the former things will profit us nothing, will signify just nothing. Would it not be most unjust here to alledge the Author was degrading Orthodoxy, Zeal, Prayer, &c. just to nothing

thing in themselves, because he says they will not all stand in stead of the Duty of loving our Enemies: The Apostle in the foregoing Scriptures, tho' he says that these extraordinary Gifts will profit a Man nothing without Love to God and Men; yet he does not say, but they may be profitable for various other Ends and Purposes, *viz.* the Gift of Tongues might be profitable to enable the Apostles, Evangelists and others, to preach the Gospel to foreign Nations, whose Language they had not an Opportunity of learning in an ordinary way: He does not say but the Gift of Miracles were profitable for various and valuable Ends and Purposes; such as healing many poor diseased Creatures, relieving many that were possess'd with Devils: And in general confirming the Faith of many in the Truth of the Doctrines of Christianity, when they saw the Preachers so eminently countenanc'd and favour'd by God; so neither does Mr. *Carlisle* (tho' it cannot stand in stead of Holiness) deny that Subscription may answer all the following valuable Purposes which we of the General-Synod believe it does.

1st, The Subscription of our *Westminster*-Confession of Faith is a strong Barrier against Innovations and Corruptions, in both Doctrine, Worship and Discipline.

2dly, It gives Ministers mutual Confidence of one another's Soundness in the Faith.

3dly, It gives us Confidence in the Soundness of the Young Men whom we licence to Preach, as also to the People who hear them, or call them for their Pastors, when they know that they are of the same Faith with themselves, seeing they have subscrib'd.

4thly, It gives Joy to other Protestant reform'd Churches to know that we believe the same Divine Truths with them; tho' the Scheme or Plan in which these are laid down in both their Confession, and ours, be different one from another.

5thly, It vindicates the Church from invidious Callumnies, which might be cast upon us, as if we believed things which we abhor; or deny'd some essential Doctrines which we firmly believe.

6thly, Our Subscription hands down from Age to Age, to our Posterity with moral Certainty, what the Doctrines were which we profess'd, and many other valuable Purposes, too tedious now to mention.

Now, tho' he has said, that Subscription or Non-subscription of the *Westminster* Confession availeth nothing, without Holiness or Faith which worketh by Love, or keeping of the Commands of God, which nothing in Earth can stand in stead of; yet if he has ever said that it cannot answer all these six valuable Ends and Purposes I have mention'd, or any one of them, I shall give up the whole Debate; but if you cannot prove this, then as you have said seventeen times in your Book, that he has reduc'd Subscription to nothing, these seventeen bold and groundless Assertions of yours will justly be reckon'd by all fair, candid, judicious Readers, as seventeen malicious Non-truths.

Page 23, you own, "That when our Synod first pass'd the Act of Subscription, they then no doubt judg'd Subscription an excellent Means for preserving Harmony in Doctrine, and preventing unhappy Divisions, and grievous Debates; yea esteem'd it a strong Barrier that avail'd not a little against dangerous Innovations, a great Duty, and a laudable Practice, a thing of very great Moment and Importance in many desirable Respects." I reply, we look upon Subscription to this Day, as an excellent Means to obtain these valuable Ends, and others that I have mention'd above. You say, "Then Ministers were Subscribers in Sincerity." I own it, and I reply, They are so still, as I shall make fully appear: And it is very uncharitable, nay I had almost said impudent in you, without authentick Proof, to assert, or even to insinuate the contrary.

You say, "then Subscription might have been talk'd of, as an Argument to prove them not *New-light* Men." And I reply, our present Subscription is as good an Argument to prove the same still: You add, "*Sed tempora mutantur*, &c. but the Times are chang'd, and the Synod's Sentiments are chang'd with them." To which I reply, the very contrary of what you here assert so groundlessly and impudently, without the least Degree of Shame or Modesty in you, I'll make appear to be undoubted Truth, for rectifying the Mistakes concerning our Synod which some weak well meaning credulous People may have fallen into; and to prevent others for the future from being impos'd upon by you, and others of your Party, who have so little regard to Truth.

Our General Synod at *Magherafelt*, in June 1749, renew'd an old Act which had been for many Years observed, in this Church for the Subscription of our *Westminster* Confession

of Faith, which runs in these Words, *viz.* "All Candidates for the Ministry in this Synod, both at their first and second Tryals, and Ministers to be install'd, shall subscribe our *Westminster* Confession of Faith according to the following Formula, which is the only one in Use; and to be observed by each Presbytery within the Bounds of this General Synod; *viz.* I believe the *Westminster* Confession to be agreeable to, and founded upon the holy Scriptures, and as such I own it as the Confession of my Faith; as witness my Hand."——And the Sanction enforcing said Act is this, "Every Presbytery licencing, ordaining, or installing, contrary to this Act shall be censured according to their Desert, and the Probationer so licenc'd, shall not be entertain'd nor employ'd as a Preacher in this Church, and the Person so ordain'd or install'd shall not be received nor continued a Member of this Synod."——You say to Mr. *Peebles*, Page 22d & 23d, that "he has wisely conceal'd in the dark both our Synod's Act or Acts injoining Subscription, and the Formula which our Ministers do subscribe. You know (say you) if your Design in this was, to prevent the World from an Opportunity of judging about the Form or Force of the Act you boast of, for until we see Copies thereof, we cannot so well know, whether the Synod enjoins the Confession to be subscrib'd, only as a Bond of Peace, or according to the above quoted Formula of the Church of Scotland; or only as far as the Subscriber supposeth it to be agreeable to the Word of God; in which last Sense, any Man might subscribe the *Turkish Alcoran*, or the *Papish Manuel*, while he is not requir'd to declare by Subscription that he sincerely owns the Doctrines thereof as agreeable to the Word of God." To which I reply, Tho' it did not perhaps lie in Mr. *Peebles*'s way to favour you with what you desire, *viz.* a Copy of our Act and Formula, yet I have now done it; for we have no Act or Acts that we need conceal or keep in the Dark; we are under no Reserves this way; we blush not to let our Acts be known, when there is any Occasion for doing so: You may now make what Use of it you will, but if you think proper to criticize upon it, it would be advisable perhaps for your own Character's Sake, if you have any regard to it, not to pervert the obvious Sense and Meaning of it, as you have done with a witness to both Mr.

Carlisle's and Mr. *Delap's* Sermon.——The Formula tho' short, is very comprehensive, and so plain that one would think it needs no Explication; however if any should be given, I think the Members of the Synod have a better Right than any others to do it, according to the old Maxim, *Cujus est condere Leges Ejus est Explicare*, i. e. The Law-makers have the best Right to explain the Law.

We would observe, 1st, that the Formula consists of two Propositions, the first of which is contain'd in these words, "I believe the *Westminster* Confession of Faith to be agreeable to, and founded upon the Holy Scriptures." Where one may observe, that the Proposition is universal, without any Restriction or Limitation whatsoever: i. e. We believe the whole Confession, every Doctrine contain'd in it, without any Exception. The latter Part of the first Proposition is also very unexceptionable, viz. that this Confession, or all these Doctrines contain'd in it, are agreeable to and founded upon the Holy Scriptures, the best and surest Foundation no doubt, upon which any Doctrines can be built.

The second Proposition is explicit, plain and unexceptionable also, viz. "and as such I own it as the Confession of my Faith, as Witness my Hand"——i. e. after all the Light that I can obtain from the Father of Lights by Prayer, and the closest comparing the said Confession with the holy Scriptures, and finding it agreeable to them, and founded upon them, I therefore subscribe it as the Confession of my Faith. Here one may see plainly,

1st, That we do not subscribe it only as a Bond of Peace, as you alledge.

2dly, That we don't subscribe it in an equivocal and loose way: viz. as far as it is agreeable to the holy Scriptures, as if we believed that some of the Doctrines in it, were agreeable to the Scriptures, and some not; in this loose way, a Man might subscribe the *Papish Manuel*, nay even the *Alcoran* it self; but we subscribe without Exception or Limitation, that we believe the whole of it, every Doctrine contain'd in it to be agreeable to and founded upon the Word of God.

1st, From the Strictness of the above Act injoining Subscription, every judicious Person will observe, that our Synod have done the utmost in their Power to preserve the Purity of this Church in Doctrine.

2dly, From the Justness of the Sanction enforcing it,
viz.

viz. the Presbytery acting contrary to it, to be censur'd according to their Demerit. The young Man so licens'd not to be employ'd or entertain'd as a Preacher or Probationer in this Church; the Person ordain'd so, not to be receiv'd as a Member of this Synod; and the Person install'd, not continu'd as a Member in this Synod: What could Men have done more?

3dly, From the cordial Harmony and cheerful Unanimity in all the Members of this Synod, in so unanimous a Manner voting and establishing said Act, without so much as one dissenting Voice. The Soundness of our Synod sufficiently appears,

4thly, From the Conduct and Practice of our Synod since said Act was renew'd, it will further appear, how careful we have been to maintain the Purity, of both the Doctrine and Discipline of this Church.

But perhaps it may be objected, thus the Act indeed was good, if it had been strictly executed; but what signifies the best of Laws, if they be not put in due Execution? To which I reply: I shall shew you sufficient Instances of the Execution of said Act since it was renew'd. The first is this; We were inform'd before we left the Synod 1749, that there was a young Gentleman in our Bounds who had been transported to another Congregation, but had not been install'd; we order'd his Presbytery to instal him before our next Synod, according to said Act, and if he would not submit to it, that he should not be continued a Member of this Synod; and so he left us, and join'd the Presbytery of *Antrim*. The second Instance is this, Another young Man had been ordain'd, whose Subscription had not been sufficiently attested to us, we enjoin'd him by Name to subscribe according to the aforesaid Formula, otherwise he should be declar'd no Member of this Synod.

5thly, It would be observed, from the Time in which this Act was renewed, there had elaps'd no more than four Years since the Synod 1745 in which Mr. *Clark* asserts Mr. *Carlisle's* Sermon had made our whole Synod *New-light* Men: The Ridiculousness of which sufficiently appears. For how difficult, nay impossible, is it for any Man of common Sense to believe that a Synod intirely of *New-light* Principles, as he represents that of 1745, shou'd in the Space of four Years, intirely to a Man, change their Principles, and become rigid *Old-light* Men, and unanimously make such an Act,
and

and enforce it by such Sanctions, as effectually to exclude every individual Person of non-subscribing Principles from us in all time coming? Had there been any Members in our General Synod in 1749, when the Act was renewed, of non-subscribing Principles, can any Man suppose they would have sat as mute as Fishes, not giving in a Protestation, nor even entering their simple Dissent; not muttering a Word against the Act, but on the contrary, cheerfully voting for it? He that can believe this may believe the greatest Contradiction, even Transubstantiation itself. — Neither can it be here objected, that the Members who sat in the Synod in 1745 and in 1749 were intirely different Persons; this might possibly happen in the General Assembly of the Church of *Scotland*, who meet by Delegation, but cannot possibly happen in our General Synod while we meet in our usual Way, where each Minister yearly has Access as a Member. There might be indeed some individual Members in the one who were not in the other, some by Death remov'd, and some new Members added; but in the main, the two Synods in 1745 and 1749 consisted of the same Members. — Neither can it be here said, that Mr. *Clark's* Book oblig'd the Synod for their own Credit to make or renew said Act; for said Act was renew'd before ever he commenc'd Author, before ever he (that we know of) appeared in Print, yea before any of the Members perhaps heard that there was such a Man in Being.

Page 23d you say to Mr. *Peebles*, “but seeing you confidently affirm it impossible to prove your Synod New light Men, because (say you) they are all Subscribers; and your Rev'd Father Mr. *King*, in his Letter, Page 27, also positively asserts that there is not one single Member that has not subscribed at least twice. Did the Rev'd Mr. *Moody*, did Mr. *Plunket*, did Mr. *Fleming* subscribe?” I positively affirm the same that Mr. *King* has said, and am ready to prove it from the Records of our Synod, in which we have a particular Account transmitted to us from all the Sub-Synods within our Bounds, of each Person who is a Member having twice subscrib'd, first at his being licens'd, and secondly at his Ordination. Which I could easily do by transcribing our Records as far back as we have Members now alive; but I think from what I have said of the Strictness of our Act, the Sanction annex'd to enforce it, and our Practice and Conduct exactly correspond-

sponding to it, both before the Act was renewed and since, may be enough to satisfy any reasonable unprejudic'd Mind, and nothing will satisfy others. — I observe nothing in all your three Instances, contain'd in your three Queries concerning Messrs. *Moody*, *Plunket* and *Fleming*, that in the least contradicts what Mr. *King* has said; for its well known that before Mr. *Moody* went to *Newry* he had subscrib'd twice; first at his being licens'd, and secondly at his Ordination in *Magherally*: And the other two Gentlemen were not Members when Mr. *King* wrote. — But that Mr. *Plunket* has subscrib'd twice, is evident by the Records of his own Presbytery. With regard to Mr. *Fleming*, the Case seems to be this; before the old Presbytery of *Monaghan* was divided, a Quorum of said Presbytery met when he was to answer his *extempore* Questions and subscribe, in order to his Ordination; just when all was over, the remaining Members of the Presbytery came, and desired the Brethren, that the Presbytery might constitute and enter upon his Tryals; the Moderator told them, that was done, and he had answer'd to their Satisfaction, and subscrib'd; the late come Members alledg'd that ought not to have been done, in their Absence, and that they had a Right to hear him over again to their Satisfaction also, and to see him Subscribe; the other Part alledg'd it was their Fault that they had not come sooner, and that they took too much upon them, to overhale what had been Presbyterially done: And no doubt sharp Words pass'd on both Sides; for good Men have had their Outfalls: *Paul* and *Barnabas* had sharp Words, and parted about *John Mark*. And tho' they were both found in the Faith, and well employ'd in their Master's Work, we don't hear that ever they met again.

It is not my Business here to justify or condemn any Party, but briefly to relate Matter of Fact; and this seems to have been the Occasion of the Division of the Presbytery, this Matter making an Impression upon the Minds of several Members of the Synod, in different Presbyteries; our Synod unanimously enjoin'd Mr. *Fleming* to subscribe, because of what has been above related; and in Case he do not, before the meeting of our next Synod (after this Injunction was given) to be declared no Member of this Church. And what could Men do more than we have done in this Case to preserve the Purity and Peace of this Church?

With

With regard to what you say concerning Mr. *Moody*, "doth he continue to officiate among the People in an independent and irregular Way?"—To which I reply, not at all, he does not; for can any candid Mind suppose that we should be so partial as to enjoin one Gentleman expressly by Name, to be install'd, before our then next Synod, or be declared none of us; and connive at Mr. *Moody* in the very same Circumstances? But in the 2d Place, for Argument's sake, giving, tho' not granting that it was so, as you say, with respect to Mr. *Moody*; cannot you find that the great Mr. *Robert Bruce* remain'd much longer, and officiated as a Minister to a Congregation in *Edinburgh* than he has done in *Newry*, without any formal Ordination; and yet that was a very pure Church at that Time, and he a very sound, holy, and great Man; and we don't here that ever he was call'd irregular or independent. For this see *Calderwood's History*, Page 218 (says he) "He was not resolv'd to take the Charge simpliciter, but was content to bestow his Labours upon *Edinburgh* till the next Synod, and as he found himself then resolv'd and meet for the Charge, he should continue, otherwise he would be free; and after he had essay'd the Burden, and found the Blessing of God upon his Travels, he accepted the Charge."—And tho' he continued there from July, 1587, to the 27th of August, 1605, to the time of his Banishment to *Inverness*, which was 18 Years; yet we cannot learn from any of the *Scottish* Historians that ever he was ordain'd in Form; and during his 4 Years Banishment in *Inverness* he always exercis'd his Ministry among that People without any Instalment; as the aforesaid Author tells us Page 469. If it should be said here, that these 4 Years was a disturb'd State of the Church, and that he was every Year after another expecting to be remov'd out of *Inverness*, I readily grant it; but during the 18 Years of his Ministry in *Edinburgh* it was not so.

I come next to consider how you have (Page 25) very unjustly represented the Presbytery of *Dromore* in their Answer to the Appeal of the Presbytery of *Armagh*, as classing the Members of our General Synod into three different Sorts, entirely inconsistent with one another. Your Words are these; "and as that Presbytery are of your own Party; I hope you will not reject their printed Testimony anent this Affair; their notable Words are as follows," Page 4

"We

"We the undernamed Ministers have been long the mournful Spectators of the unhappy Scene opened among us, occasioned by Difference in Judgment and Conduct." Then they go on (as you say) to describe the several Actors in said unhappy Scene.—"1st. (Say they) Some have been, and are against common Confessions in all Churches, sound and unsound, and regard them as Engines of Discord, and Division.—2dly. Others think that all the Articles in our Confession may be lawfully assented unto.—But a third sort judge some of them are not true, and if they were true, yet some of them are of such small Importance, that they ought not to be made Terms of Ministerial Communion.—Again *ibid* Page, some of the younger Fry (say they) that run upon the Scent of the Elder, have given strong Hints that they have Points in Religion yet to publish, but can't safely do it, till People are prepar'd to receive them."

I answer with respect to the first of these three Sorts, who have been, and are against common Confessions in all Churches, sound and unsound, and regard them as Engines of Discord and Division; the Presbytery of *Dromore* in said Answer cannot possibly be understood to mean any Members of our General Synod, for this Reason; because they say, Page 5, "there are none now among us that openly espouse the non-subscribing Principles, or absolutely refuse their Assent to our common Confession, but join in Presbyteries where this is required, as a Condition of ministerial Communion." If it should be enquir'd, Who are the Persons meant by these Words then? I answer briefly, The Members of the Presbytery of *Lutrim*, and none other; particularly by these, who have been against common Confessions, &c. we are to understand the antient Members of that Presbytery who are now dead; and by those who are against common Confessions, &c. we are to understand those who have surviv'd, and those who have been plac'd in the Congregations of those that are deceas'd in that Presbytery, who regard indeed Creeds and Confessions as Engines of Discord and Division; and whose Custom is, to order the Candidate to draw up a Confession of his own Faith in his own Words. The Proof would rise higher that it could not be any Members of our General Synod which the Presbytery of *Dromore* meant by the first Sort, if it were consider'd what I took notice of in a former

Page,

Page, namely the universal Concurrence of the whole Synod in 1749, in their renewed Act enjoining Subscription: For can any Man of common, nay of the lowest Degree of Understanding imagine, that if there had been any Members who were against common Confessions, &c. and regarded them (and the *Westminster* in particular) as Engines of Discord and Division, that they would have sat as mute and silent as Fishes, when such an Act pass'd, nay not only so, but even given their Concurrence and Approbation of it; ne who can believe this, may believe it possible for the same thing to be and not to be at the same time; nay he may believe Transubstantiation itself (which is the greatest Contradiction to common Sense) and is not to be argued with, as a reasonable Creature.

This will also help us to understand who the Presbytery meant by the Young Fry, namely Probationers, or newly ordain'd Ministers in the Presbytery of *Antrim*, for as like usually begets like, these Fry shew who spawn'd them. I would take notice here of the great Impropriety of the Metaphor us'd; for Fry never run at all upon any Scent, they always swim.

With regard to the second Sort, that think that all the Articles of our Confession may be lawfully assented unto; you and I have no Controversy about their Principles, but only about their Numbers.

I come now in the next Place to consider who are meant by the third sort in the Presbytery of *Dromore's* Answer to the Appeal, and the best Light perhaps that can be given of this Matter, as also of the Protestation enter'd by the twelve Ministers with regard to Mr. *Aprichard's* Affair, will be obtain'd by giving a brief and true Account of what happened in the old Presbytery of *Armagh*, before the Presbytery of *Dromore* was erected, which seems in a great Measure, to have been the Cause of the Division of said Presbytery. In the Year 1739 Mr. *Richard Aprichard* had entered upon 2d Trials, and when he was call'd to subscribe, he scrupled at some Doctrines in our Confession of Faith, particularly, concerning the Extent of the Civil Magistrate's Power *Circa Sacra*, that is about holy Things, contain'd in the 23d Chapter and 3d Section of our Confession: As also concerning the Salvation of the Heathens, and some other Things. The Presbytery were divided in their Sentiments about him, some of them thought,

that provided he gave them Satisfaction as to his Soundness in general, by subscribing all the other Articles of our Confession, he might be indulg'd with respect to these he scrupled (and having known his Sentiments with respect to some of these Doctrines) that it appear'd to them, he did not differ from the Confession, so much in Sense as in Words; others were of a contrary Opinion, and thought that no such Indulgence was to be given to any Man, for if we once begun to give way in this Manner concerning our Doctrines by way of Indulgence to particular Persons, it was not known where such Things might end: That such a Practice had a native Tendency to hurt the Purity of this Church. In these Circumstances the Presbytery could not ordain him. The Matter was laid before the ensuing General Synod, which decreed to lay him aside.

Much about the same time there was another young Man, viz. Mr. *Blair*, upon first Trials in the Presbytery of *Root*, who scrupled some Doctrines in our Confession, the Presbytery unanimously rejected him, and so he join'd the non-subscribing Presbytery of *Antrim*. Now from this historical Account it is easy to see who are meant by those who judge some of the Doctrines in our Confession not true; namely Mr. *Aprichard* and Mr. *Blair*, who never were Members of our Synod; and by those who judged that some of the Doctrines are of such small Importance, that they ought not to be made the Terms of Ministerial Communion, they mean the twelve Protesters in Mr. *Aprichard's* Case. But whatever personal Regard the Protesters might have had for the young Man at that Time, their not opening their Mouths against the Renewal of our Synodical Act enjoining Subscription afterwards, without any Limitation or Indulgence to any with respect to any one Doctrine in our Confession; but on the contrary heartily and cheerfully concurring with their Brethren in said Act, plainly shews, that they have seen Reason since to think, that what they did in favour of him, they ought not to have done, or in favour of any other in like Circumstances. Their pleading in favour of him is what we are to understand, what the Presbytery of *Dromore* mean by acting in a vigorous Subserviency of the non-declaring Principle, which they never avow'd. No doubt whilst this Affair happened in the old Presbytery of *Armagh*, during the Debate, sharp Words pass'd on both sides, which is too common a Case,

when Differences arise between Brethren ; Ministers are but Men, and the best and holiest have their Frailties and Corruptions in this imperfect State ; and even good Men sometimes are too apt to make the molt of what they can, of Things in the heat of Dispute against one another. You add, " Now while these three Sorts sat in Judgment as Members of the Synod, being of opinion that Confessions are Engines of Division, containing Doctrines not true ; then certain it is, that a Judicature made up of such Members could never ingenuously subscribe." To which I briefly reply, I have made it already abundantly plain, that the first sort (who are against all common Confessions, and regard them only as Engines of Division) have not sat in our Synod as Members for upwards of twenty-seven Years, since the Year 1726, that the Non-subscribers were excluded at *Dungannon* : And hence it follows, that it is a groundless Falshood in you to say, that all these three sorts sat in our Synod in 1741, 1742, 1743, and in 1745, just as great a Falshood as if you should say, that two and three don't make five, or that there is not a Sun in the Firmament.

SECTION II.

Containing a particular Answer and Confutation of the groundless Charges, and malicious Calumnies which Mr. Clark has brought against the GENERAL SYNOD in his 2d Section.—The first is Page 29th of the Survey.

" **T**HAT not a few Members of your General Synod do frequently admit to the Lord's Table, several Persons who in their common Discourse, are profane Swearers, by GOD, by FAITH, TRUTH, and CONSCIENCE ; and such as are grossly ignorant of God, and the holy Scriptures, yea ignorant of the common and fundamental Principles of Religion, contain'd in our Catechisms, Confession, and Directory : There are several People in your Ministers Congregations, with whom I have had Occasion to converse, who when ask'd, could not tell how many Natures and Offices Christ hath ; nor how many Commands are in the Moral Law, nay nor what are the Sacraments of the New Testament, yea Per-

sons

sons who ordinarily chequer'd their Discourse with the above Oaths, and yet affirm'd that they had been frequently admitted to Sealing Ordinances.

Here is a dreadful Charge laid against us, which if fully proven, without any other, would be sufficient of it self to degrade us from our Office, as Persons intirely unworthy of the Character of Ministers of the Gospel, as unfaithful to our Lord Jesus Christ, and unfaithful to the Souls of Men.

One would expect here that the Proof brought to support a Charge of such heinous Crimes, should have been undeniably strong, clear and distinct ; that we should according to the common Principles of Equity and Justice had the Time when, and the Place where, these Things were done ; but no such thing is told us : It might have been expected also, that you should have given us the Names of the particular Ministers who are guilty of these Crimes, that they might have been punish'd according to their Desert, but this is not done either : You only in a loose and indeterminate Way, tell us, " that not a few Ministers do so and so." We might also have expected you would have given us the Names, Number, Places of Abode, of the Witnesses ; but nothing of all this is told us ; they may now live in *Mexico* or *Japan*, or within the Bounds of *Tartary* or *India*, for any thing you have said : But to let these Things pass, which you affect to cover in Darkness ; let us a little enquire into the Character of the Witnesses ; one might indeed have expected that Witnesses brought to prove such an heinous and grievous Charge against 150 Gospel Ministers (for the indefinite Term not a few, may take in the whole Synod) should be of an unspotted and unstain'd moral Character, knowing Persons, of Integrity and Veracity ; that they should be unexceptionable Witnesses in any Court whether Civil or Ecclesiastick ; but the very reverse of this is the Character which you your self give of your Witnesses, namely, that " they are profane Swearers in their common Discourse ; not only do they swear by Faith, Truth, and Conscience, but, by GOD!" And, 2dly, you say that " they are grossly Ignorant of the Natures and Offices of Christ, of the Commands of God, and of the Sacraments of the New Testament." You say " those grossly ignorant profane Swearers told you, yea and swore by the above Oaths, by Faith, Truth, and Conscience, yea by GOD, that they had been frequently admitted to Seal-

"ing Ordinances." Now, Sir, considering the Character you have given them, their Testimony must go for nothing: *see Steuart's Collections of the Discipline and Government of the Church of Scotland, Page 264*, whose Words are these, "No infamous Person can be admitted an Accuser," neither can you, or any of the *Seceders* in either *Scotland* or *Ireland*, considering what Contemners and Despisers of the Mother-Church of *Scotland's* Authority you have been at the time of your seceding and since, be admitted as Accusers, because of what he says, Page 265, "Neither are such as are Contemners of Church-Authority, or who have been in former Pursuits rash and calumnious, to be admitted Accusers." But here I observe the old *Latin* Proverb holds good between you and your infamous Witnesses, *Simile similibus Gaudet*, Like loves like. But I would ask you in the first Place, how you could believe them, seeing they were such notorious common Swearers? For according to the common Observation, those who commonly Swear will frequently Lie; but, 2dly, How could you believe them, seeing you say, they were so grossly Ignorant as not to know what the Sacraments of the New Testament or Sealing Ordinances? might they not have taken Catechising, or the Minister's Prayer in the Family, for Sealing Ordinances? It's Plain they might, by your own Confession have taken either of these for Sealing Ordinances, seeing they knew not what are the Sacraments of the New Testament.—Can any Man believe that you are free of malicious Credulity, or great Weakness of Understanding at least, to take up a malicious, groundless Calumny from the Mouths of such grossly ignorant, wicked Wretches, against the venerable Synod of *Uster*? These Wretches by this time, are probably become *Seceders* (for they seem by Malice and Ignorance sufficiently qualified for *Seceders*;) and therefore you are ashamed to tell us their Names; but until you do so, the Calumny must ly upon your self, for no Man is oblig'd to take your bare Word for it.

Were you not afraid of the dreadful Threatning of the Word of God, contain'd in the ninth Commandment; (*Thou shalt not bear false Witness against thy Neighbour*?) and of what is said in *Rev. xxi. 8. All Liars shall have their Part in the Lake that burneth with Fire and Brimstone*? If you have forg'd this Calumny your self, and even if you have not, but really heard it from such Persons,

whose

whose black Character you have given, so as to render them infamous, and not to be credited by any good or wise Man; are you not afraid of being excluded Heaven by what the Psalmist says in the xv Psalm, for taking up an ill Report against your Neighbour?

If you had serv'd your Informers as an honest Justice of the Peace in this Kingdom serv'd his, in the Reign of King *Charles the II.* who offer'd to inform against a Presbyterian Minister, you had acted more like an honest Man; says the Informer to the Justice, "I was at a Conventicle last Week," and I can tell you who preach'd, and several of those who were Hearers." "Well," says the Justice, "what do you remember the Minister said, what was the Text?" and what said he upon it?—Spoke he any Treason, Heresy, or Sedition?" "Nay," says the Fellow, "I cannot come to Particulars, for I cannot read; but (swearing a great Oath) by his Soul, the very Text it self was both Treason and Sedition!" "Get you gone," says the Justice, "or I'll commit you to the Stocks this Moment, you ignorant, malicious, cursing Villain; was the Word of God Sedition and Treason?"

The second Irregularity Page 31, is "admitting to Sealing Ordinances such Persons, as altho' they be Heads of Families, yet ordinarily neglect daily and duly, to worship God in their Houses."—We absolutely deny this groundless Charge, that we admit Heads of Families to the Lord's Supper, or as Sponsors for their Children in Baptism, whom we positively know to be habitual Neglecters of Family Duty; we put you to the Proof of this Calumny: You don't pretend to know this from your residing in those prayerless Families whose Heads have been admitted to Sealing Ordinances amongst us, nor do you even give us as Vouchers so much as your scandalous former Witnesses, your grossly ignorant, profane Swearers. You insinuate likewise that we admit to the Lord's Table such as we know are Neglecters of secret Prayer. This we absolutely deny also, that ever we have admitted any knowing them to be such; tho' Persons may deceive us and tell us that they do it, when they do it not; but this Sin lies upon their own, not our Heads; we exhort and press the Necessity of both family and secret Prayer, by all prudent Methods in our Power both in publick and private, both in Sermons and private Conference, in our visiting

from

from House to House; we tell them, that prayerless Families are godless, christless, and hopeless Families; we press young Communicants to secret Prayer, we admit them not to the Lord's Table, until we have it from their own Mouths, that they are praying Persons; we exhort them to continue in Prayer, not only a little before and after the holy Ordinance, but to persevere therein to their Lives End; and when we understand that any of them are growing remiss, slack and careless this way, we admit them not again, without sharp Reproof, earnest and pathetick Exhortation, and solemn Promise of Amendment. This is our Method as far as I know, and I presume I may be allowed to have a better Opportunity of knowing what are the Customs and Methods of admitting Persons to the Lord's Supper in the Bounds of the General Synod, than any *Seceder* in this Kingdom, having been so long a Minister in this Church.

"The third Irregularity that comes to be consider'd, in not a few of the Members of the General Synod, is, their very indolently neglecting that great Duty of duely visiting and catechizing such Families, whether Sick or Poor, belonging to their respective Congregations, in that way and Manner which the Word of God and the known establish'd Rules of this Church injoin." Here we have nothing to sustain this heavy Charge, for if we be not content with your ignorant common Swearers, your Affidavit Men, who will probably swear any thing you bid them, whom you produc'd as Vouchers for the first Charge, I believe we need expect no other; for I believe you have none else to give; and indeed it's just as good to want them as have them. If you were an honest Man your self, I would rather take your Word for a thing, than forty of their Oaths. But to be more serious in the Matter; I positively aver, and assert, that thro' the whole Bounds of the General Synod (as far as I know) it is our usual Custom to visit and catechize yearly (if the Bounds of our Congregations be tolerably narrow) but if large, and the Families numerous, *viz.* in some 450, some 500, or 600 Families, to visit one Year, and catechize another; and for the Truth of this I appeal not only to our own several Congregations, who cannot but perfectly know it, but even to those of other Persuasions, who cannot but take notice of it also; and so careful are we that

none

none be neglected, that if we find any that were absent in our last Diet of catechizing, we take them in our next, if we can find them; and we usually appoint Days for catechizing the Absents, when the several Diets are over; and after all, if some will not come out, it is their own Fault not ours, we can't help it; and we find that solid useful Christian Knowledge, is greatly promoted by this; perhaps more, for so much time spent, than by any other way of Instruction; and in our congregational visiting (if our Memories serve us at the Time) we pass not by the poorest Cottage of any of our Communion. This general Practice of ours is perfectly agreeable to the Custom of our Mother-Church of *Scotland*, as Mr. *Steuart* tells us, in his Collection of Discipline, Page 175, "It hath (saith he) been the laudable Practice of this Church, at least once in a Year, (if the Largeness of the Parish, or bodily Inability, or other such like do not hinder) for Ministers to visit all the Families in their Parish, and oftner if the Bounds be small, and they be able to perform it." And from the Reason of the Thing the same Allowance may be justly made with regard to catechizing, *i. e.* when the Parish is large, or bodily Inability, or some other such like do hinder.

And when our Presbyteries keep their parochial Visitations, if we find any Minister defective herein, we admonish and censure him, according to his Desert. You say Page 34, "Nor do I hear of the Neglecters being brought to any Censure by the few Observers thereof."

Sir your not hearing of it is no Argument that it is not done; tho' you have stroll'd a good while through this Country, there are a great many Things you never heard anything of: I believe you are not very fond to attend our Presbyteries where such things are to be heard, since the bold Stand you made with Mr. *King* in *Dromore*, you think it prudent perhaps not to go again; but how could you expect to hear this? Neither you, nor your tattling former Intelligencers, the grossly ignorant common Swearers can be admitted, nor have any Right to be in our Presbyteries during our private Censures; and we ourselves don't think it prudent, nor consistent with the Nature of the Thing, to publish to the World the private Censure of Admonition, or Reproof given to a Brother, for a first Fault, nor intended to publish it for his Shame, but for his Amendment

ment in a brotherly way.—Page 35, you say, “ Unless
 “ a Minister examine his People, travel and converse of-
 “ ten with them, particularly about their Souls State, how
 “ can he know, if they be lean with spiritual Diseases,
 “ perplexed with Doubts, Temptations, &c.”—I an-
 “ swer directly, it is impossible he should; and we are en-
 “ deavouring with Dependence upon Divine Grace, to be
 “ as diligent this way as we can, as our bodily Ability will al-
 “ low, and as the other Parts of our ministerial Duties will
 “ permit, such as private Study, assisting at Sacraments, at-
 “ tending the Judicatures of the Church, &c.—But dear
 “ Sir, how do you, or how possibly can you strictly observe
 “ this, in travelling so constantly among your Flock, when
 “ it’s notour through five Counties, that you have been ab-
 “ sent from them for more than six Weeks at one time, and
 “ frequently both before and since, wandering through other
 “ Congregations as a *Quack Doctor*? For either of these, and
 “ especially for both, you ought to have been suspended,
 “ and if you would not reform, depos’d and degraded from
 “ your Ministry: For Mr. *Calderwood* in his History of the
 “ Church of *Scotland* in her purest Times, viz. 1582, Page
 “ 124, and Mr. *Stewart* in his Collections also tells us, Page
 “ 293, that by an Act of Assembly then made, a Minister for
 “ forty Days (together in a Year) Absence from his Kirk, ne-
 “ glecting his Office, was to be depriv’d or depos’d, with-
 “ out a lawful Impediment allow’d by the next General
 “ Assembly; nay for four Sabbaths in a Year, by the 8th
 “ Parliament of *James* the 6th, without a lawful Cause.
 “ See *Stewart’s* Collections, Page 281. Now you see your
 “ self, that according to the Acts of the Church of *Scotland*,
 “ you ought to have been degraded; and it were more wise
 “ in you, voluntarily, of yourself to demit, than to be con-
 “ strain’d and obliged to do it with Shame, according to just
 “ Discipline, if you had any such thing among you. See al-
 “ so the Rev’d *John Quick’s* Discipline of the reform’d Church
 “ of *France*, Page 25, Canon 47. “ Dissertation of the Flock
 “ “ without lawful Leave deserves Deposition;” And for
 “ your practising Physick, hear what he says in the 19th
 “ Canon of the Discipline of the Church; “ No Minister,
 “ “ together with the holy Ministry shall be a Practitioner
 “ “ in Law, or Physick; yet out of Charity he may give
 “ “ Counsel and Assistance to the Poor of his Flock, and of
 “ “ his Neighbourhood, provided always, that he be not
 “ “ thereby

“ thereby diverted from his Calling, nor derive any Gain
 “ from his Practice; and all Consistories, i. e. Sessions, and
 “ Colloquies, i. e. Presbyteries and Provincial Synods,
 “ shall have a most special Care and Regard, that this Can-
 “ “ on be punctually observ’d; and suspend such as trans-
 “ “ gress it from the Exercise of the Ministry.” Now Sir,
 “ these base Practices of yours, in absenting yourself so long
 “ from your Flock, practising Physick in distant Parts from
 “ your Congregation, and taking Money for so doing, are
 “ too bad to be defended, being expressly contrary to so many
 “ Rules and Canons of the most famous Protestant Churches,
 “ and too notorious to be deny’d: However if you should
 “ deny them, I’ll prove them against you, not by such Vouch-
 “ ers as you produce against the Synod, grossly ignorant com-
 “ mon Swearers; I would be ashamed to produce such to at-
 “ test any thing; but by twelve Persons of Knowledge and
 “ Integrity, nay twenty-four if you please, whose Characters
 “ are establish’d in their Country, whose Testimony could
 “ not be rejected in any Courts, from the highest to the low-
 “ est in the three Nations, whether Civil or Ecclesiastic:
 “ Some of whom have paid you Money for your Practice;
 “ and others of them have disputed your Charge as too high,
 “ and did not honour your Bills, but return’d them unpaid.
 “ I would have you to consider diligently your unjust Accusa-
 “ tion of the General Synod, in neglecting their Flocks; and
 “ your own Practice together, in being so long absent from
 “ them; and at the same time recollect what the Apostle says,
 “ *Rom. ii. 1. Therefore thou art inexcusable O Man, who-
 “ soever thou art that judgest, for wherein thou judgest an-
 “ other, thou condemnest thy self, for thou that judgest doest
 “ the same things.* Don’t you think but the Study and Prac-
 “ tice of either of these two honourable Professions, of Divi-
 “ nity or Physick, are a Barthen heavy enough to a Man of
 “ the greatest Parts and Capacities? If you think otherwise,
 “ that some are able with a good Conscience to discharge
 “ both, I am fully perswaded you are singular in this Opinion,
 “ as you are in many other Things; I am sure the Apostle
 “ *Paul* was of another Mind, concerning the Ministry, that
 “ it was Work sufficient for any Man; when he says, *Who
 “ is sufficient for these Things?* and he enjoins the E-
 “ vangelist *Tim. i* Epistle iv. 13. *Give Attendance to Read-
 “ ing, (not Physick be sure, but Divinity) to Exhortation, to
 “ Doctrine;—Meditate (saith he, ver. 15) on these Things,*
 “ give

give thy self wholly to them; that thy profiting may appear unto all. How can you profit your People this way, when you have been strolling through the Country the whole Week among your Patients, and enter the Pulpit unprepared? Must you not give them, as we say, *Quicquid in buccam venerit*, any Thing that comes uppermost; what comes first to your Tongue's End, a Discourse which you never premeditated? is not this to serve God with that which cost you nought? Though *Luke* be called the beloved Physician, and practis'd Physick, before he commenc'd a Preacher and an Evangelist, yet the sacred Scripture is perfectly silent of his practising so afterwards; he did not incline to do it; nor would the Apostle *Paul* have suffered him. I would have you to consider your own Words, Page 35th, "That Congregation is in a sad Case whose Minister behaves as if he thought that the ministerial Labour of the whole Work was over almost as soon as the publick Worship of the Sabbath is ended, and spends the rest of the Week in attending upon his own secular Affairs." [And is not your practising Physick such?] Is this to serve God in the Gospel of his Son? Is this to be instant in Season and out of Season? travailling as it were in Birth to have Christ form'd in Souls; spending, and being spent for them? &c. For Shame's sake Man, quit and leave off your Quacking in Physick any more in this publick and scandalous Way; don't take the Bread out of honest Physicians Mouths, who have devoted themselves to that Study; don't do to others what you would not desire they should do to you; live and let live; let every Man live by his own Profession and honest Calling. If you understand any thing in Physick, you may practise *gratis* among the poorest of your own poor People at *Gribby*: Do them all the Good you can, and this will keep you at home among them; but don't shew yourself so greedy of filthy Lucre as to practise abroad for Money. And besides all this, the People in this Part of the World, how fond soever they seem'd of you at first, yet I know not how it comes to pass, but they now are beginning to have but a mean Opinion of your Judgment in Physick, and alledge you know but little about it; Some who have been your Patients think you charg'd them too high, are putting themselves under the Care of others; some I'm told flatly deny to pay you, because they know you have not Licence; and you know, Sir, to sue them at Law, upon the Statute of

Quantum

Quantum meruit, is both tedious, troublesome and uncertain; so I believe you had as good quit it altogether, for I believe within a little you'll make nothing of it.

"The 4th Irregularity that may be notic'd among many of your Members is their supinely neglecting to cause every Family within their respective Charges to keep in their House at least one Copy of the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, Confession of Faith, and Directory for Worship; so that in some Congregations belonging to certain Members of your General Synod the Minister might go thro' more than twenty Families before he could find among them one Copy of said Confession and Catechisms."

I believe Doctor, you are not a good Searcher; with my Consent you shall never be employ'd in the Revenue, until you learn to search better, or the King would loose by your Bluntness; but perhaps it was your former ignorant Intelligencers, the common Swearers that told you so; if this was the Case, you ought not to believe them, or no Body will believe you; for they being so grossly Ignorant, and consequently cannot read, they would not know a *Confession of Faith* from any other Book of the same Size, even tho' they saw it: But did any Member of the General Synod tell you so, that he could not find one Confession in twenty contiguous Families, as he was visiting his Congregation? such a Person indeed had been a proper Informer; but you dare not say that any such (who had the best Right to know) inform'd you of this; or did you personally search so many Families your self and could find none, this you dare not say neither: For what Pretence or Right could you have to search People's Houses who don't belong to your Association, unless you had a Warrant?—But perhaps these twenty Families, though they live within the Limits and Bounds of some of our Congregations, may be of another Communion, viz. of the Church of England, of the Church of Rome, or Quakers; if so we have no Right to cause them keep them. If this be your Meaning, it's perhaps true what you say, but nothing to the Purpose; but if you mean that these twenty Families live all contiguous together, and are of our Communion; I fancy, dear Doctor, you have only dream'd that you travelled so far and found none, because fanciful People sometimes take vivid and lively Dreams for Realities, and can scarcely be persuaded of the contrary afterwards when their Eyes are open, and especially

specially those that deal so much as you do among hypocritae and hysterical Persons (it's laid) are apt to catch the same Disorder themselves; and if this be your Case, perhaps I should not anger you, for they tell me such Persons are very impatient of Contradiction, they can bear nothing, and that Anger is almost Death to them whilst labouring under that Malady.——But to do you Justice, you don't say that a Minister did go, but that the Minister might go and not find one Confession in twenty Families; and so we have only a *may be*, against his finding one, and we have just as good a *may be*, for his finding nineteen in twenty Families, or twenty Confessions in nineteen Families: Was ever such trifling heard; to accuse so many Ministers for meer *may be's*, without the least Colour of Proof?

But to be more serious in this Matter, though according to your usual Custom you have supported your groundless Charge (which we absolutely deny) with no Evidences; we who are Members of the General Synod, for the Satisfaction of honest impartial Persons of our own Communion, faithfully declare what we do, to recommend and propagate that excellent Book our *Westminster* Confession, &c. and we appeal to all of our own Communion for the Truth of what we say.

1st, In our Baptizing, we take the Parents Assent and Consent in a solemn way to the Doctrines and Duties contain'd in our Confession, and Larger and Shorter Catechisms, and their solemn Vow and Promise to bring up their Children accordingly; because we are persuaded that all the Doctrines and Duties contain'd in them are contain'd in the Holy Scriptures, the sacred Fountain, from whence all saving Truth and Christian Duties flow.

2dly, In our catechizing, we constantly use all the three, the Shorter with those of younger Years, and weaker Capacities; and the Larger, and the Confession with those of more advanced Age, and riper Judgment and Understanding; and we earnestly recommend all the three to them as excellent Means to advance in Christian Knowledge, as being the best System, or Body of Divinity any where to be found, and next in Value to the Holy Scriptures themselves, being perfectly agreeable to them, and founded upon them.

3dly, When we visit, we diligently enquire if they have a Confession in the House; if not we earnestly recommend it to them, to buy one: The next Time we visit, we enquire if

if they have got it? and if we be dubious, we call for it, to see it, and if they have it not, we chide them sharply, and by this means we prevail with many to purchase them.

4thly, To the poorer Sort of our People, several of our Ministers bestow Confessions, and especially to young Persons as Premiums for getting the Questions well, and for committing to Memory some Chapters of the Confession. In a Word we do all that lies in our Power, to encourage and press each Family within our Bounds to get Confessions of Faith, and diligently to peruse them; and it gives us great Joy, that they are daily becoming more plenty among us, by our great Diligence and Industry in recommending them: Persuaded I am, there are in the Bounds of the General Synod, three Confessions for one that was in it about thirty Years ago. So far are we from what you say Page 37, "Reckoning them not worth House-Room, or as old Almanacks out of date, not worth reading." That we look upon them, as we have always done, to be valuable Treasures of Divine Truths, deserving justly the best Place, after the holy Scriptures, not only in our Houses, but in our Memories, in our Hearts and Affections.

From what I have said, of the Care which our Synod takes, by their Act, and Sanction, to have our Confession subscrib'd, which all our Presbyteries conform to in Practice, and from what Pains our Ministers take in their respective Congregations both publicly and privately to recommend it, your Fears, "that the Posterity of Protestant Dissenters in the North of Ireland will not be able in a few Years to know, what those Principles of the Christian Religion were, which their Fore-fathers held"—are perfectly chimerical Panick, and groundless; you are afraid of your own Shadow; we hope, our excellent Confession, which contains an excellent Abridgement of our religious Principles, shall be always in good Esteem and Repute, and handed down, from Father to Son, to the latest Posterity in the North of Ireland, until Time give place to Eternity.

The fifth Irregularity is of Ministers reading their Sermons in Publick; Page 37 you say, "The next Irregularity and Disorder in not a few Members of your General Synod, is their reading what they call their Sermons, on the Sabbath Days, instead of preaching the Gospel to the People." Here I shall honestly confess, that this is so far

Matter of Fact, *viz.* that some Members of our Synod do read their Sermons, which is a Practice that in the general I do not approve; I am for first committing our Sermons to Writing, then to our Memory, and so to repeat them in the Delivery, without Notes, unless they be old Men, whose Memories usually in the decline of Life, frequently are not so tenacious, but oftentimes fail, even while their Judgment continues, almost, if not altogether, as sound and strong as ever; in such a Case, it would be a very great Hardship, and Loss to the Church of Christ in general, and their own Congregations in particular, that they should be intirely depriv'd of the remaining Part of the most useful and edifying Labours of such worthy Members, merely for want of a little Indulgence to their Pastor's great Necessity; that their Mouths should be stop'd, and they silenc'd, purely for the Loss of what they could not possibly keep or retain.

Page 38 you say as followeth, "Nor did I ever know any Instances of Sermons thus read, blest for the Conviction and Conversion of Sinners, or Comfort of Saints." Now I find you argue very closely, like a good Logician, the above Argument without any Force or Violence done to the Words of it, may be reduced to an *Enthymem*; the *Proposition* is this, *viz.* I never knew any Instance of Sermons thus read blest for the Conviction or Conversion of Sinners, or Comfort of Saints; and then the Inference is, therefore Sermons thus read, have never been blest for said Purposes. Or if your Words be reduced to an intire Syllogism, your Argument will stand thus, *viz.* Nothing hath ever been blest for the Conviction and Conversion of Sinners, or Comfort of Saints, but what you have known, but you have never known read Sermons blest; for the Conviction and Conversion of Sinners, or Comfort of Saints; and therefore read Sermons have never been blest for either of these Ends. Now is not this prodigious Pride, Arrogance and Vanity in you, to set up your Understanding as the Standard of all Things that are done, that nothing has been or can be done, but what falls within the Compass and Extent of your Knowledge? But to let this pass; dear Doctor, how will you reconcile what you here say, with respect to read Sermons, with what you have said Page 90, concerning your Charity for the Church of *England*, whose Ministers constantly read their Sermons? Your Words are these,

these, "I frankly own that I comfortably hope, and charitably believe, that there are pious Christians; in the Protestant Church of *England*, &c.—which are of Christ's little Flock." Now reconcile these two Sentences, for my part I confess I am unable to do it, for I have no Skill in reconciling Contradictions; and I believe it will give your self enough to do. Now where is the Ground of your comfortable Hope, and your charitable Belief? you have your self destroy'd the Ground of your Faith and Hope with respect to the Church of *England*. Can you think that they are pious Christians, and yet have never been convicted, nor converted, nor edify'd? all their Sermons are read from the Pulpit to them; and you say you never knew Sermons thus read blest for Conviction. According to these two Sentences of yours compar'd together, Persons may be pious Christians, and yet at the same time be both unconverted and unconverted. What monstrous Inconsistency and glaring Contradiction is this! It's shocking to any Man of Common Understanding! And yet these Things are the native Consequences of what you say in the two above quoted Sentences; Perhaps because they lie above fifty Pages alunder in your Book, you had forgot the first before you wrote the second. You say also, "If they want the Gift of Memory, then they are not sufficiently Gifted, nor is it by them the Word of God is to be preached, nor have they any Business at all in the Pulpit, until they first obtain that Gift, otherwise they run unsent; and if so, God saith they shall not profit this People at all." Now by these Words, which are chiefly levelled against a few in the General Synod, you virtually endeavour intirely to degrade from the Office of Preaching the Gospel all the Ministers of the Church of *England*, and most Part of the Dissenters in that Kingdom, and the whole Establish'd Church in *Ireland* also; for it is certain, and not to be contested, that generally speaking, all these read their Sermons; which must either be for want of Memory, which you say intirely disqualifies for being Ministers, or want of Will to use their Memories, which no doubt you'll reckon worse; and therefore you say they run unsent; and God hath said they shall not profit this People at all." Now if to read Sermons, be the same as to run unsent, and if those that run unsent, shall not profit this People at all; pray how can you, or how dare you say, that there are pious Christians in that Church, when

you say their preaching Ministers run unsent? how are Sinners convicted and converted, and how are Saints comforted or edify'd? One would, yea must think from what the Apostle saith, *Rom. x. 14.* that Faith cometh by Hearing, and Hearing by Preaching, and Preaching by those that are sent of God; It is no Wonder that the Church of *England* and the establish'd Church in this Kingdom should have no great Opinion of your Sincerity from what they see in your Book, in one Page pretending to have so much Charity for them, and in another non-churching altogether. They have an Opinion that *Seceders* are great Dissemblers, by comparing your Principles as *Seceders* and your Practice and Conduct together. For Instance, one or two of your Ministers were summoned before a Magistrate in this Neighbourhood to take the Oaths of Allegiance to his Majesty King *George*, and Abjuration of *Popery* and the *Pretender*; their Pretence was, that they had no Scruple at all against the Oaths, but only at the manner of swearing, *viz.* Kissing the Book; that they were willing to swear, by holding up their Right Hand, as is the manner of Swearing in *Scotland*: Whereas in your *Act, Declaration and Testimony*, and in your second Act concerning the *Doctrine of Grace*, ye own and acknowledge the Oath of Abjuration (Page 101) as one of our National Sins, and in the former Act ye say, and bewail it, that some of your selves were so far left, as to take the Oath, for which ye desire to be deeply humbled; *i. e.* as I understand your Words, ye own ye were left or deserted by God, when ye took the Oaths, and ye now repent that ye have taken them: Now this gross Dissimulation before the Magistrate was only to save them from paying forty Shillings of a Fine. I can fully prove the Instance I have above given of your Brethren's inconsistent Conduct, with their known and publish'd Principles, by Witnesses of unobtain'd Characters.

To conclude this Accusation about reading Sermons, I told you before, that I don't like, nor approve of the Practice, nor pretend to defend it: I never us'd it my self, and hope I shall never be under the disagreeable Necessity of reading. There are but comparatively very few in our Synod who use Notes, and I heartily wish there were none: I would have had no controversy with you upon this Head, but I thought you carried things quite too high; to deny the whole of the Protestant Ministers of the Churches establish'd

in *England* and *Ireland* to be sent of God, because they read, I think is very harsh and uncharitable, to say no worse of it.

Page 40, "The sixth Irregularity Charg'd against the General Synod is, you say, their giving themselves up to a kind of political Neutrality, and supinely neglecting, fully, particularly and expressly to preach, and write with suitable Edge against the Swarms of *New-light* Errors, and insolent Vices, which have too long invaded the Interests of Religion in this Province."

Here we absolutely deny this malicious, false and groundless Charge, but that we frequently, with all the Edge and Force we are capable of, preach against these several Errors that you mention; for the Truth of which we can appeal to the many Thousands of judicious Hearers, who constantly attend our Ministry, and others of different Persuasions, who occasionally hear us. I did not think before I saw your Pamphlet, that any Man living had so much Impudence as to charge us, with such a notorious Falshood.

And several of the Members of the General Synod (some whereof are dead, and others yet living) have wrote also, against several of the Errors you mention. See the following Papers, *viz.*

- Mr. *Masfartown's* Doctrine of the Trinity;
- Mr. *Gilbert Kennedy's* Answer to Mr. *Halliday*;
- Mr. *Iredall's* Letter to Mr. *Halliday*;
- Mr. *Thomas Kennedy's* Book with regard to Mr. *Ap-
prichard's* Case;
- Mr. *McBride's* Defence of the Overtures, together with Mr. *Haltrige's* Appendix.
- Mr. *Samuel Delap's* Synodical Sermon, and that one which he preach'd on a publick Fast-Day, December 18, 1745.

You say, "how long may a Man attend their Sermons, ere he hear them give a full and express Warning against the many *Pelagian* and *Arminian* Errors?" To which I reply, he need not attend very long until he hear these warn'd against, and confuted in several of our Meeting-houses.

But might I venture to ask you Doctor, how you came to know, that we are so negligent in preaching against these *Pelagian* and *Arminian* Errors? Was it from your own personal

personal Attendance, or the authentick Report of others who did? The first I presume you dare not say, for you have not had an Opportunity of hearing the fourth Part of the Members of our General Synod preach, and perhaps when you did hear them, the Subjects which they were upon, would not allow them to mention or confute these Errors, without making a wide Digression, which perhaps they are not so fond of, as some of you *Seceders* are.

Or was it from others? and very likely it was, viz. your former Intelligencers, that tell you every thing about us, whom you produc'd as Vouchers for the first Charge, because you never adduce any others for the several Things you charge us with; if this was so, their Testimony will not hurt as much in the Judgment of wise Men, for they being so grossly ignorant, could not discern the Difference between *Pelagianism*, *Arminianism*, and *Calvinism*, or between *New-light* and *Old*.

But to be serious in this Matter; it is evident to the World, that we of the General Synod have met with far worse Treatment from *Seceders*, than might have been justly expected from *Heathens*, in being condemn'd unheard, not seeing our Accusers Face to Face, and upon anonymous Libels. To prove this beyond all Possibility of Contradiction, I shall quote the two following Passages, to shew that we might have justly expected far better Treatment from *Heathen Romans*, not only under the mild Administration of *Augustus*; but even under the Emperor *Trajan*, when the Persecution rag'd hottest against Christians.

The first Passage is in *Acts* xxv. 16. The words of *Festus* the Roman Governour of *Judea* concerning *Paul*, who was unjustly accused of the *Jews*, To whom (says he) I answered, it is not the manner of the Romans to deliver any Man to die, before he who is accused have his Accusers Face to Face, and have Licence to answer for himself concerning the Crime laid against him. We see here, it is against the very Law of Nature, which these *Heathen Romans* observ'd, to condemn any Man unheard, without Liberty and Opportunity to answer for himself, and to see his Accusers. And what shall we think of *Seceders*, Mr. Clark and his Brethren, who pretend to be Christians, and the purest sort too; who condemn the whole General Synod, upwards of One hundred and forty Men unheard, without Liberty

Liberty to answer for themselves before him their Judge; and without seeing their Accusers Face to Face, or even so much as knowing what their Names, Number, Capacity, or Characters are?

The second Passage we have in the Emperor *Trajan's* Answer to *Secundus Pliny*, the Roman Governour in *Asia*, who had wrote to the Emperor, how he should conduct himself, with respect to the Christians during the Persecution, particularly those who had been accus'd by Libels, without the Names of the Authors.

The Emperor writes to him from *Antioch*, Anno Dom. 107, the 9th Year of his Reign—"Trajan to *Pliny* Greeting, as to the manner of your Procedure my *Secundus*, in examining the Causes of those who have been brought before you for being Christians, you have taken the Course which you ought to take; for no certain and general Law can be so fram'd, as shall provide for all particular Cases: Let them not be sought for, but if they be accus'd, and convicted, let them be punish'd; yet so, that if any denies himself to be a Christian, and shall give Evidence of it, by doing Sacrifice to our Gods, altho' heretofore he hath been suspected, let him be pardon'd upon his Repentance: But as for Libels, publish'd without the Names of the Authors, let them not be valid as to the Crimes they Charge, for that were an ill Precedent, and not the usage of our Reign." See Doctor *Cave's* Lives of the Fathers, Page. 22.

What shall we now think of *Seceders* who condemn almost One hundred and fifty Men by Libels, without the Authors Names? Are not they worse than *Heathens*? The latter would condemn no Man so: See the Emperor's Letter quoted above; he says, "that would be an ill Precedent." It's not from ancient *Romans* as *Heathens*, that you have any Precedent for such Conduct, but it's probable it's from modern *Romans*, viz. the Managers of the *Inquisition*. I know of no Men on Earth that do so but the Managers of the *Papish Inquisition*, and *Seceders*. Is this Conduct of yours consistent with your high Pretensions of being the only Reformers of the Age? Is it at all consistent with the Laws of the Gospel? Is this consistent with our Saviour's Rule, *Matth. vii. 12. Whatsoever ye would that others do unto you, do ye the same unto them*? Is this consistent with the Law of Nature? Let Christians, nay let *Heathens* judge.

If I were not afraid that I have anger'd you a little by what I have now said, I would ask you two or three Questions, because you complain that we write not against the prevailing Errors of the Age : It is not to be question'd but you and your Brethren write against them with suitable Edge. Who of you have answer'd and confuted the following Books, which are too plenty, and contain the following Errors, namely *Deism*, *Arianism*, *Socinianism*, *Pelagianism*, *Arminianism*, &c.—Which of your Brethren, or have you yourself answer'd *Tindal* and *Morgan*? By whom is your Answers printed? Of what Size is each Volume? And what is the Price? We have indeed seen some Answers to these Books, such as Dr. *Cannybear's*, *Chapman's* *Leland's*, &c. But we might expect something from you, wrote in Answer to these with a more suitable Edge.—Please also to tell me, who of you *Seceders* have with the most suitable Edge answer'd *The Appeal to Common Sense*, and the *Independant Whig*. All these are commonly reckoned dangerous Books against reveal'd Religion. And you'll greatly oblige me also, if you please to tell me, which of you have answer'd with the sharpest and most suitable Edge these following *Arian* and *Socinian* Books, which are full of *Pelagianism*, and *Arminianism* also, namely *Whiston's* Writings, *Samuel Clark* on the Trinity, *Chubb's* Works, and the *Essay on Spirit*; a late Book done by an anonymous Author, equally dangerous with any that I have last mention'd: If you favour me with satisfactory Answers to these Queries, you'll greatly oblige me, and others of my Brethren: And we'll consult you for the future, in the Choice of what new Books we buy: And I have only one Favour more to ask now; perhaps I don't rightly take up your Meaning in that Expression in your Accusation, of our not preaching and writing against Errors with suitable Edge; if by that Expression you mean using the strongest Arguments, and closest Reasoning in our Power, with a becoming Christian Zeal, against these Errors, we do it; and your Charge is very groundless and unjust; but if you mean that we don't preach and write with suitable Edge, *i. e.* that we don't scold, and use opprobrious and reproachful Words, and *Billingsgate* Rhetorick against Men, who maintain these Errors, your Charge is perfectly just, and we are all guilty, we frankly own; for we leave that way of managing Contro-

Controversies to you *Seceders*, who seem to have already monopoliz'd that Method entirely to yourselves; and we confess, to do you Justice, that you are far more capable of using these Edges than we are. For you and Mr. *Swan-son*, and two or three more of you, would beat the whole General Synod with these Edges.

I come now to consider, and answer the 7th, 8th and 9th Irregularities charg'd by you against the General Synod, from Page 43d, 46th, and briefly to convince every honest Reader, how groundless they are; for Proof of which you quote Mr. *Delap's* Sermon, Page 19th, preach'd at *Letterkenny* at a publick Fast, *December* 18th, 1745.

The 7th is, Ministers imitating Heathen Moralists.

The 8th, Ministers profaning God's Name and Sabbath.

The 9th, Ministers neglecting Family-Worship.

I shall quote the Paragraph from Mr. *Delap's* Sermon entire. "Alas! some Ministers of the Gospel affect to imitate Philosophers in Lectures of Heathen Morality, rather than the Apostle *Paul* in preaching Christ crucify'd, and other distinguishing Doctrines of Christianity and Christian Morality: Some also are an evil Example to the Flock, by profaneing God's Name and Sabbath, and neglecting God's Worship in their own Families." Indeed if there were no Ministers of the Gospel in these three Nations, whose Sins he was bewailing, on that Fast-Day, but the Members of the General Synod; then of necessity it must be some of them he mean't; but every body knows, that the Case is far otherwise in *Britain* and *Ireland*, that there are various Sorts and Kinds of Ministers of the Gospel, *viz.* of the three Establish'd Churches, of *Scotland*, *England*, and *Ireland*; of the *English Dissenters* of different Denominations, *Presbyterians*, *Independants* and *Anabaptists*—of the General Synod, of the old *Covenanters*, *Scottish Episcopals*, *Moravians* and *Seceders* of different Sorts, *Burges-men* and *Antiburges-men*, &c. Now on that Day of Fasting and Humiliation for the Sins of *Britain* and *Ireland*, how can you know in which of the three Nations these Ministers live, or of what Denomination that he bewails as guilty of these Crimes? It might have been seceding Ministers for any thing you can know to the contrary; his Words are so indeterminate and uncertain, as they stand in the aforesaid Paragraph, that I defy all men living, but himself, or those that he told it to since, to understand who the

the Persons were, or of what Denomination. Sure he gives you no Room or Ground to understand these Ministers to be of the General Synod, more than of any other Denomination that I have mention'd above; he does not say, alas! Some Ministers of our own Communion, or our own Perswasion; or, alas! Some of our own Number; no, by no Means, but only in the general, alas! Some Ministers of the Gospel, &c. — But I shall now fully satisfy every impartial Reader as to the Innocence of all the Members of the General Synod, with respect to these three Crimes.

Mr. Delap having heard that these Words in his Sermon were charg'd by some against some Members of the Synod, and not being able in the Year 1751 to attend the Synod, requested the Rev'd William Boyd of Tayboin, his Copresbyter, in his Name to inform us that in the 19th Page of his Sermon, wherein some Ministers of the Gospel are said to be guilty of such Things as are there express'd, he mean't no Member nor Members of our General Synod, for he never knew one of them guilty of such sinful Practices: and Mr. Boyd gave said Information before fifty Eye and Ear-witnesses. And certainly Mr. Delap must be allow'd to know better than any Man living, whom he mean't, and whom he did not, by these Words, "alas! Some Ministers of the Gospel," &c. and it seems a Piece of strange Conduct in you to force a Gentleman to testify against his Brethren, both against his Will, and beyond his Knowledge! You ought after this Information, to publish an Advertisement, for removing the Calumny, That you mistook Mr. Delap's Meaning when you wrote the Survey, that he can bear no Testimony against the Synod; if you do not this, which is your Duty, you must and will be reputed by all honest Men, a malicious Calumniator and false Accuser.

I shall pass by all the Conjectures you make, how our Ministers break the holy Sabbath and profane God's holy Name; for having depriv'd you of Mr. Delap's Testimony, to support your threefold groundless Charge, all that you have said upon these three Heads, must go for nothing. For if your Foundation be destroyed how will you support the Superstructure? the whole surely must fall to the Ground.

Page 47th you say to Mr. Orr, "Now from what has been said, I think it is abundantly evident, that not a few of those Ministers who are Members of your General Synod have acted very irregularly in administering the Sa-

"craments,

and otherwise breaking through several scriptural and known Rules of the Church of Scotland." To which I briefly reply, from what I have said, in answer to your several groundless Accusations (for none of which you have adduc'd any solid Proof;) I hope the very contrary will appear.

You say, "in considering the above Irregularities you have not chosen to name particular Members of the General Synod who are guilty of them." — To which I answer; this confus'd Way of accusing, and punishing the innocent, promiscuously with the guilty; of condemning the General Synod in Bulk for the Faults of some few, albeit these Things were true, as they are not, is not God's Way; Gen. xviii. 25. *That be far from thee to do after this Manner, to slay the Righteous with the Wicked; and that the Righteous should be as the Wicked, that be far from thee; shall not the Judge of all the Earth do right?* and the Apostle tells us, Gal. vi. 5. *For every Man shall bear his own Burden.* — But you know very well that this General way of accusing, answer'd your own Interest, to augment your Flocks, and increase your Party; for by accusing the General Synod in this Manner without naming particular Members; you hop'd to draw off a Number of weak credulous People. You add, "if you'll thence take Occasion to reckon on all I have now said, meer Calumny, and in bare Assertions pronounce against it as Slander, and Reproach; yea and to proceed to deny it in Bulk; then be not afraid but in due Time you shall have both Names and Facts particularly instructed." — *The Mountains are in Labour, and a Mouse is brought forth.* Here are great swelling Words, big with Terror. We look upon all you have said hitherto (except that of reading Sermons, for which I know of no express Rule for or against it in any Protestant Church; though I own I don't like the Practice) to be meer Calumny, groundless Slander and Reproach; I oppose it not in Bulk by bare Assertions, but in particular, by what I apprehend are conclusive Arguments: And never spare the General Synod, but as soon as you please, tell the World all the Ill you know of it; and of every particular Member of it, but no more, and lay each Crime upon the particular guilty Person, that they may be known and punished according to their Desert.

But

look upon you to have renounced the Covenant; and cause Parents publickly, to God, before the Congregation, to confess and acknowledge it as a Sin, in having had their Children baptiz'd by any of your Party; this late Fact is too notour in this whole Neighbourhood to be contested, it can be proven by forty Witnesses. Your Assumption, or second Proposition in your hypothetical Syllogism, I deny; and have proven the several Parts of it to be false and groundless already, in my Answer to your first Section, to which I refer my Reader; namely that some Ministers in our Synod are against all Confessions, in all Churches, sound and unsound, &c. so that according to the logical Rule, *conclusio sequitur debiliorem partem*, one of your Premisses being false, your Conclusion must be false also, *i. e.* it is neither true, that we are an unlawful constitute Court of Christ, nor is it true that ye have any Right to preach here.

Your second Syllogism has no better Foundation than your first: Your Argument in it is founded upon your false and groundless Charges, laid against the Synod in your second Section: which I have proven, in my Answers to them particularly, to be ill-natur'd, malicious Calumnies; *viz.* our Ministers prophaning God's Name and Sabbaths, &c. Thus Sir, I have endeavoured, as you say, to pull the Beam out of the Synod's Eye, or rather have fully shewn, that there was none in it. And now you and your Party may endeavour as well as you can, to pick the *Motes* (as you call them) of irregular Conduct and unlawful Constitution out of one another's Eyes, which I believe will give you picking your fill. Page 50 you say,

"From what has been already advanced, it appears with Evidence nothing inferior to mathematical Demonstration; that there are no proper Judges belonging to your Party, who as such, have any Right to inspect my Authority, seeing your Judicatories are no right constitute Courts of Christ."—One would be apt here to imagine by your comparing your groundless Calumnies, and bare Assertions without any Proof, (many of which are self-evident Nontruths) with a mathematical Demonstration, which is built upon self-evident Axioms, which all men agree in, and which no man can deny nor so much as suspend his Assent from them for one Moment, that you really know not what a mathematical Demonstration is: And as you talk Page 97, and 98, of Messrs *Arrot, Paton, and Mulligan*, being capable to teach Mr. *Lynd* and Mr. *Peebles* a Lesson in

in Divinity, I would as a Friend advise you to go and read *Euclid*, and something of Geometry, with some proper Person, before you talk any more about Surveying, and mathematical Demonstrations, lest those who understand those Things laugh at you, for speaking and writing of Things that you know nothing about.

I come next to consider your pretended Authority from the self-erected Presbytery of *Glasgow*, which you give us Page 52, in the following Words, "*At Stirling June 27, 1749, The Associate Presbytery of Glasgow being met, and*" Considering the clamant Petitions, and warm Supplications now lying before them, from several dissenting Congregations in the Kingdom of *Ireland*, for supply of preaching, notwithstanding that two of their Number are now settled there: appointed Mr. *Thomas Clark* a Probationer under their Inspection, to repair to the Kingdom of *Ireland* as soon as he can, within the Month of July next, and to preach to the Congregations who have apply'd to this Presbytery, particularly *Balibea* in the County of *Monaghan*, *Clananees*, *Carland*, and *Tarmond* in the County of *Tyrone*. And likewise the Presbytery recommends to him to preach in any other Community who shall on good Grounds apply to him to have the Gospel preached among them; and they appoint him to continue in *Ireland* ay, and until the Presbytery shall see meet to recal him. Extracted by *James Fisher* Minister, "*Clark pro tempore.*" I would here make some Observations upon this Extract of your Credentials.

1st. With respect to your Bounds. 2dly, With respect to your Time. And 3dly, With regard to your Power. The first is exceeding large; the second is indefinite; and the last without any Restriction or Limitation whatsoever. First, I would take notice, that the Bounds mentioned in your Commission is exceeding large, *viz.* all *Ireland*; a larger Extent by the half, than the Apostle gave the Evangelist, *Titus* i. & 5. *For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the Things that are wanting, &c.* Here you have for your Bounds the whole Kingdom, without Exception of one Parish in all the four Provinces of *Ulster, Linster, Munster, or Connaught*; for you are appointed to preach, not only in the four specify'd Places, who had already apply'd, but to any other Community, who should on good Grounds apply to you, to have the Gospel preached to them, without

Exception of any Part of the Kingdom; and here you are to be the sole Judge yourself of the Regularity of their Application.

I would, 2dly, Observe, that the Time mentioned in your Credentials is express'd in a very unusual and unprecedented Way; far Different from what the antient Church of *Scotland* used in her purest Times. See the printed Acts of Assembly, Page 152, 153,——191. which sent over in the Year 1642 and 1643, to the poor scattered Flocks in this Kingdom, Messrs. *Robert Blair* of *St. Andrews*, and *James Hamilton* of *Drumfries* and their Brethren, two by two that Year; and in 1643 Messrs *William Cockburn* of *Kirkmichael*, and *Mathew McKail* of *Carmanock*, and their Brethren, two by two; The first Year's Commission was limited to four Months, and the 2d Year's Commission to three Months only. But yours here, might have continued all the Days of your Life, yea forty or fifty Years, if you happen to live so long. A strange, unprecedented, boundless, unlimited Commission! But what need I say, strange Men, and new Religions must be indulged to have new and strange Customs. But,

3dly, I would Observe, that the Power you have given you in this Commission is very great, yea intirely unlimited; in these Words, "and likewise the Presbytery recommends" to him, to preach to any other Community, who shall "on good Ground apply to him, to have the Gospel preach'd" among them."

Here you have the whole Power in your own Breast, to demolish what Congregations you will, and to erect what Congregations you please, to pull down and to build up, at your Discretion; to model all the Kingdom at your Pleasure; You are not even enjoin'd to concur with, or consult Messieurs *Black* and *Means*, who have been ordain'd before your Commission, or even to take their Advice in any difficult Emergency: Nay, though you were only a Probationer, and they ordain'd Ministers, you have a Power not only independent of them, but really above them; for even their Congregations are not excepted from your Power. For if any two or three of either of their People be disgusted at them, and apply to you, you might according to this ample Commission judge that they had good Ground for so doing, and so preach to them, and erect them into a separate Society, distinct from their former Places of worship; for any Disgust at their Minister, is sufficient for a Seceder.

Neither

Neither can it be objected to what I have said, that you were to be accountable to the Presbytery of *Glasgow* for your Conduct; nay not at all, there is no such thing in the whole Commission. How vastly different from yours is the Commission which the General Assembly gave the Brethren who came to *Ireland* in 1642; tho' they were aged Ministers, and of long Standing and Experience in the Church, yet the General Assembly in their Commission charge them in these following Words, "as in the Sight of God, that "in Doctrine, Worship, and Discipline, and in their daily "Conversation, they study to approve themselves as the Ministers of Jesus Christ; and that they be comptaible to the "General Assembly in all Things." See the above quoted Acts. But here, no such Things are enjoined you. One would be apt, by this unlimited and lax Commission of yours, to suspect that the Zeal of the Presbytery of *Glasgow* was beginning to grow a little cool, about the Purity of the Church, in Doctrine, Worship, Discipline, and the godly Conversation of their own Preachers, in signing such unlimited and loose Commissions; nay their Zeal seems not only like *Ladicea*, some what cool and lukewarm, but entirely frozen.

If I were familiar with you, I would ask you, dear Doctor, did not your Head turn a little giddy, being so young a Man, when you got this ample Commission, being invested with so great Power to move in so large a Sphere, to be created at once Metropolitan and Patriarch of all *Ireland*, accountable to none? I don't doubt but it did, and no wonder; for so much Power was enough to have turned a stronger Brain than yours. And the Consequence of this, we see and feel, in your giving so rash, imperious, tyrannical, and groundless a Sentence of Condemnation against the whole Synod of *Ulster*——I would, to conclude, this Section, observe,

1st. With regard to the Certificates you produce of your being a loyal good Subject of King *George's*, signed by Sir *Robert Pringle*, and *William Brice*, Sub-sherriff of *Stirling*, and *John Goldie* Sub-sherriff of *Drumfries*, that we have not seen these original Certificates. 2dly, Neither; if we had, could we know them to be genuine, we being unacquainted with these Gentlemens Hands. But, 3dly, I would observe that it is a very strange thing that you are a very good and loyal Subject in *Scotland*, to his Majesty, and not in *Ireland*, seeing you scruple to swear the Oath of

H 3

Allegiance.

Allegiance to him, and to abjure his Rival and Enemy the Pretender. This is a strong Suspicion, that you are not so good and loyal a Subject here, as they say you are there. I thought the old Proverb had generally held true, *Cædum non animum mutant qui trans mare currant*, i. e. those who travel over Seas change their Climate, but not their Mind. But I see it fails in your Case. It's an odd Matter, that two or three Hour's sailing, between *Port-patrick* and *Donaghadee*, should so disturb your Brain, as to make you change your political Principles, to turn from a *Whig* to a *Tory*, from a staunch *Williamite*, to become a non-juring *Jacobite*. I thought that *Ireland*, whose peculiar Property is to produce or nourish no venomous Beast; could never have metamorphos'd a pretended *Protestant*, into a nonjuring *Jacobite*, which is such an hurtful Creature to Society, that all loyal Protestants in *Ireland*, have a greater Aversion to, than to *Tygers*, *Bears*, *Wolves*, or *Serpents*, or the most savage Beasts or poisonous Reptiles under the Sun.

But perhaps as the *Pope of Rome* from the vast Addition of his usurped Power and Greatness, grew so insolently proud, that instead of acknowledging his Obedience and Allegiance to the Emperor, he made him hold his Stirrup, and kiss his Slipper, so your last ample Commission, making you Patriarch, or Metropolitan of all *Ireland*, has made you so insolently proud, that you disdain to swear Allegiance to our Sovereign King *George*. In short, laying Banter aside, there are a great many things observed in you *Seceders*, which laid together, would amount to a strong Suspicion to sound Protestants to believe you not good and loyal Subjects to his Majesty King *George*, nor satisfy'd with the present Government. — As first, none of all the Seceding Teachers will take the Oath of Allegiance and Abjuration. 2dly, You own it as a national Sin in your publick Writings. And this is not the private Opinion of a few of you, considered in a private Capacity, but of the whole collective Body of you in your *Act*, *Declaration and Testimony*. 3dly, You make your People swear they believe it to be a national Sin (if you act consistently with your selves) when they swear your new Covenant. 4thly, In said *Act* some of you own, that ye were so far left (I suppose you mean left of God) as to take it, for which ye desire to be deeply humbled. 5thly, Mr. *Swanson*, one of your Number, preaching at *Loughachery* in this Neighbourhood, upon a Day appointed by the Government, for either Fasting or Thanksgiv-

ing, told his Audience, that he would not have them to think that he observ'd that Day out of any Regard or Deference to the King or Government, for that neither he nor the Government had any Right to appoint such a Day. Now these five Particulars being all laid together, create too justly a Suspicion in the Minds of many, notwithstanding of all your specious and fair Petences, that you are not loyal Subjects, nor staunch Friends to the present Government. We shall not pretend to judge your Hearts, that is God's Province, but these Actions of yours have no good Aspect. If you have no Perswasion of an indefeasible and hereditary Right in the Pretender, why don't you abjure him, and intirely remove all Suspicion out of our King's Mind, and the Minds of all his loyal Subjects? For whilst you and your Hearers and Followers, continue in your nonjuring Way, and especially if they should increase to any considerable Number, this doth and would more and more weaken the Courage of loyal Protestants, and encourage the Hopes of *Papists*, when we could not, and they would depend upon you, in Case of Need. With what Face can you claim the Protection of the Government, and the Benefit of the King's Laws which he is bound to maintain by his Coronation Oath, whilst you will not give him Assurance of your Loyalty and Fidelity, by your Oath of Allegiance to him? Would you have him bound and keep your selves free? Is not this Conduct very partial and unaccountable in you? Ought not all Correlatives to be mutually bound?

SECTION III.

Wherein, it is propos'd to consider if it was a regular and well precedented Conduct of the Associate Judicatories in Scotland to grant Supplies of preaching unto the Protestant Dissenters of the North of Ireland who apply'd to them; as contain'd in the 3d Section of your Pamphlet.

HERE I shall prove, that it was very Irregular, and that there is no good Precedent for it, nor any thing parallel to it in the Instances you bring, from the Conduct of the General Synod in supplying the People of *Antrim* and *Aboghill*; nor any thing parallel to it in the Conduct of the General Assembly in supplying the North of *Ireland*, in the Years 1642, 1643, and 1644:

nor yet in sending Ministers to *Aberdeen* to press the taking of the Covenant in King *Charles* the 1st's Time : Which are the only three Instances you give to justify you in this Matter. I shall make it plain to my Reader, that there is nothing in all these three that will, as a precedent, justify you in this Conduct of yours.

I shall at this Time omit the particular Consideration of the Narrative you give Mr. *Orr* (from Page 56 to 66) of the Rise and Progress of the Associate Judicatures ; intending to publish a far more impartial Account thereof, taken from the authentick Records of the General Assembly, and other Judicatories of the Church of *Scotland*, and some late Writers, Gentlemen of known Candour and Veracity, who are, or have been Ministers of the establish'd Church.

Page 66 you quote an Objection which Mr. *King* has made in his Letter to Mr. *Fisher*, Page 31, ; 'That the *Seceders* are seeking after a new Religion, &c.' To which you reply Page 67, in these Words, "Nor is it true in the Objectors to affirm that the People who join us, are seeking after a new Religion. For the Associate Ministers bring no new Bible, no new Forms of Worship, no new Government, nor any new Doctrine, Confession of Faith or Terms of Communion."—I answer, several of those Assertions of yours are false: As first, when your Followers are seeking after you, they are seeking a new Religion, as the Term Religion sometimes signifies a particular Sect or Faction.

Now as you are a new Sect, you are a new Religion never heard of in all the World until about twenty Years ago ; for your Sect cannot at all pretend to be the same with the old *Covenanters* ; for those of that way do not own you as their Brethren, but speak more bitterly against you than against any other Denomination of Protestants whatsoever ; as many can witness who have heard, in this Neighbourhood, Mr. *Culbertson*, and Mr. *Cameron*, who are for the old covenanting Way, they call you false Brethren and Deceivers.

1st, You bring a new Confession of Faith contain'd in your Act Declaration and Testimony, newer than our excellent *Westminster* one, by almost an hundred Years, consisting of the following Articles, just out of the Mint where they were coin'd.

2^{dly}, That the *Protesters* were in the Right, and the *Resolutioners* were in the Wrong.

2^d, That those who accepted the Toleration in King *James* the 1st's Time sinned.

3^d, That to take the Oath of Allegiance to King *George* is a Sin.

4th, That the Oath of Abjuration is a National Sin also.

5th, That the Union of *Scotland* and *England* in Queen *Ann*'s Time is a National Sin.

6th, That the Toleration of the *Sects* Episcopal is a National Sin.

7th, That the Assembly sinned in inflicting no higher Censure upon Professor *Simpson*, tho' they suspended him both from teaching and preaching until his Death ; with many others of the like Sort, too tedious to mention.

3^{dly}, You bring new Terms of Communion, both Ministerial and Christian ; that is, both for receiving Ministers into your Association, and private Christians to sealing Ordinances. See the Act of the Associate Presbytery annent the Term of both Ministerial and Christian Communion, Page 117. form'd at *Edinburgh*, Feb. 14, 1744. Every Person before he takes the Covenant or can be admitted either as a Minister or private Christian to your Fellowship, must own and swear that he believes all the aforesaid Articles to be national Sins. You say, you "have no new Terms of Communion, but such as were either materially, or formally enacted and observed by our Reformers in the Church of *Scotland* upwards of an "hundred Years ago ;" which every body knows to be a manifest Falshood. For many of these Things I have mentioned, the Confession of which to be national Sins you make necessary Terms of Communion with you, are such recent Facts, or new Things, which happened in our own Time, that neither the Matter nor Form of them had a Being the half of an hundred Years ago ; such as the *Union*, Mr. *Simson*'s Case, &c. One would think, that in the Church of Christ, saving and divine Faith in him, according as he is held forth in the Holy Scriptures, and a publick Profession of the Truths reveal'd in the Word of God, and a regular Life, free from Scandal, were sufficient, to qualify Men and Women for the Communion of Saints, and the sealing Ordinances of the Gospel, Baptism, and the Lords-Supper : But here in your Church, there is an human Faith in the Historians of the last Age also necessary, without which none can be admitted, without telling your Followers

Followers which of those several Historians they shall believe, who have wrote concerning those Things; or which old Man or old Woman, who lived when these Things happened they shall believe (if they cannot read themselves) who deliver these Things by oral Tradition. The Apostle saith, 1 Cor. xi. 28. *Let a Man examine himself, and so let him eat of that Bread and drink of that Cup*; but *Seceders* say by their Practice, this is not sufficient, unless he examine and ponder diligently, and firmly believe what the modern *Scottish* Historians have wrote and determined, concerning the above Transactions. Christ says, *John v. 39. Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have Eternal Life, and they are they that testify of me*; but *Seceders* virtually say by their Practice, that unless their Followers search and believe the human Histories of the last and present Age, they shall not be admitted to receive the Bread of Life at Christ's Table.

What you quote Page 68, from the Presbytery of *Dromore's* Answer to the *Appeal*, viz. "That some of their Ministers are erroneous in Doctrine, being against Confessions in all Churches, sound and unsound, and others judging some Articles therein, *i. e.* in the *Westminster*, not true," as a Reason for your coming to Preach in *Ireland*, I have answer'd sufficiently already, that by the first of these, none else can possibly be meant but the Presbytery of *Antrim*; and by the last, only Messieurs *Blair* and *Apprighard*, who never were Members of our Synod. Your second Reason for coming here is in these Words, "Some of their former Ministers had corrupted the Worship of God, by their Innovations brought therein, such as that of Mr. *Ferguson* of *Markethill*, who at the Baptism of Children never prays for the Pardon of Original Sin, nor the Sanctification of the Nature of the Child." To which I briefly reply, *a particulare ad universale, non valet consequentia*, from a particular to an universal the Consequence will not hold. For though Mr. *Ferguson* had been guilty intirely of this Omission, it doth not follow, that therefore all, or any other Member of the Synod is guilty in the same way.——But secondly, I would observe, the Presbytery don't say themselves, that Mr. *Ferguson* is guilty of the above Omission, they only give the Words of a Supplication from *Markethill* to them, in which the Supplicants only say so; but neither

neither prove it by Oath nor Witnesses. But Lastly, I would observe here, that according to your usual Custom, you are guilty of doing great Injustice to the Words of the Supplication, as the Presbytery have recorded them and transmitt'd them to us; for the Supplication which I have now under my Eye, only says, "In his Prayer after the baptism of Children, as he commonly useth the same Expositions, he never prays for the Pardon of Original Sin, nor for the Sanctification of the Nature of the Child." But it makes no mention about his omitting these things in his Prayer before Baptism, when he is craving the Divine Blessing upon the Ordinance, that it may be effectual to all the Ends and Purposes for which God has appointed it; as the Discipline of the Church of *Scotland*.——(See *Stewart's* Collections, Page 127, and the Directory for publick Worship bound up with our Confession) appoint, "That the Minister before Baptism should pray, that God would join the inward Baptism of his Spirit with the outward Baptism of Water; make this Baptism to this Infant a Seal of Adoption, Regeneration and eternal Life, and of all other Promises of the Covenant of Grace; that the Child may be planted into the Likeness of the Death and Resurrection of Christ, and that the Body of Sin may be destroyed in him, that he may serve God in Newness of Life all his Days."

Now if he prays for these Things before Baptism, (which the Supplication does not deny) as our Directory enjoins, where is there here any Innovation in Worship? But you positively assert, "That he never prays for the pardon of Original Sin, nor the Sanctification of the Nature of the Child," which the Supplication will not support; for it only says, that he never prays for these Things after Baptism; neither can you find that the Presbytery of *Dromore* ask'd the Commissioners whether or no he pray'd for these Things before Baptism? nay, they are perfectly silent about that, and deliver the Words of the Supplication just as it was presented to them: So here you have grossly impos'd upon your Reader, which is no new thing with you; it being your usual Custom. I come now to Answer your eleventh Calumny against the Synod, in mocking the Commissioners, and the twelfth, in threatening a legal Prosecution, Page 72, and 76.

I shall give a brief Account of the eleventh Charge; One of the Malecontents of *Markethill* appeared before the Presbytery of *Armagh*, and was pleading very warmly before that Presbytery, with Correspondents, to be reimburs'd from the other Party of said Congregation, seven Pounds he had laid out, towards the Repairs of the Meeting-house; as he spoke a long Time with a loud Voice, frequently directing the Presbytery, how to conduct the Affair; a certain Minister said in a Whisper to one that sat next him, he was sure that Commissioner was tir'd, for he had spoke a long Time: He took this exceeding ill, imagining, that the Minister meant, that he spoke impertinently, and not with due Regard to the Presbytery. And in great Anger reply'd, he could speak for himself in his own Cause as well as the other could Preach: Which was very provoking and unmannerly. The Minister reply'd, he believed he could Preach too, and would give him the Pulpit on a Week-day, but would not spoil the Sabbath with him. As the Commissioner left the House he said in great Anger, that he would be a Thorn in their Flesh; he would ride his Horse as far as he could go, and spend what he was able, but he would make them have thin Meeting-houses. What great Matter is here to accuse the General Synod with! only a Whisper in a Corner, occasioned by indecent and provoking Language from the Commissioner.

Your 12th Charge is in these Words, Page 72, "Al- though the People of *Markethill* offered at a Meeting of the Presbytery of *Armagh*, their solemn Declaration to clear some Facts before a Magistrate then present, yet no Security to them or their Families, to do it with Safety, was allow'd; but antecedent to their Enquiry a legal Prosecution was threatened, which muzzled one of the Parties." These are the Words which you quote from the Defence of the Appeal, Page 10th, which do not at all determine, whether these Facts which they offered to clear before a Magistrate, were of a civil, or of an ecclesiastick Kind; but in Page 76 (where you repeat this Charge against the Synod) you say, *these Facts were concerning Points of erroneous Doctrine*. How you came particularly to know what these Facts related to, whether to civil Property, or erroneous Doctrine, it's hard to conjecture. Sure the Words of the Presbytery of *Dromore* which you quote, and which I have again quoted from you, don't at all determine: And

I am

I am persuaded you have no such Intimacy with the living Members of our Presbytery, as to know from them what these Facts were; but you seem maliciously, out of your own Head, to have forg'd these Words, (viz. *concerning Points of ERRONEOUS DOCTRINE*;) with a Design to blacken the Synod.——I reason thus with respect to this Charge; Be these Facts what they will, whether of a civil or an ecclesiastick Kind, they were either true, or false and forged ones: If these Things were true, which the Commissioners offer'd their Declaration to clear before a Magistrate, it was their Duty to have done it; and no Law could have hurt them, when the Facts had been proven: And they seem neither to be wise, nor zealous for the Truth, that they were afraid where no Danger was. If these Things were false, it was their Sin to have offer'd to swear them, against any Man. If these alledg'd Facts were to be sworn before a Magistrate against the other Members of the Congregation of *Markethill*, it was not in the Presbytery's Power to give Security to the Commissioners to do it with Safety. For how could they bind up the People sworn against, from doing themselves Justice? Or, if these Oaths were against any Member of the Presbytery, could the Presbytery bind up their Brother, from seeking a just Reparation of his Wrong? Such a request of giving them Security was ridiculously made; and therefore might be justly deny'd; as if a Man should say, I'll do you an Injury, if you allow me, and give me Security that you will not hurt me, and neither resist it at the Time, nor resent it afterward. What a ridiculous and unreasonable Demand would this be? and the Commissioners Request to the Presbytery was just of the same Sort. But after all, what has the Synod to do with these Things, seeing they were never laid before it, either by way of Complaint or Appeal, never brought before it in any Shape whatsoever? but *quicquid delirant Reges plectuntur Achivi*, whatever Ill any Body does, or is imagin'd to do, the Synod must suffer for it.

I shall next consider the three Precedents you produce for your coming to preach in *Ireland*; and plainly shew my Reader, that there is not the least Resemblance of a Parallel between any of all the three, and your irregular Conduct. With regard to the first Instance of the General Assembly of the Church of *Scotland* in sending over some of their Number, at the earnest Request of the poor distressed Presbyterians Sufferers, in the Year 1642, and 1643, who had surviv-

I

ed

ed the horrid Massacre, perpetrated by the bloody *Irish* Rebels in 1641, to preach the Gospel in this Kingdom, and to break the Bread of Life among them; there is no Parallel between it, and your irregular Practice, intruding yourselves here, for this will evidently appear from the following Considerations.

1st. Some of those, particularly the first two which the General Assembly sent for the first four Months in 1642, namely Messrs. *Robert Blair* of *St. Andrews*, and *James Hamilton* of *Dumfries*, had been ordain'd Ministers in this Kingdom before, the first at *Bangor*, the second at *Bally-walter*, in the Year 1622, and had continued fixed Pastors of those Churches 14 Years, until the Year 1636, that they were both forc'd to fly to *Scotland*, during the rigid Administration of *Ld. Lieutenant Wentworth*, who press'd Conformity to the highest Pitch; so that when the Storm was over, they were but coming back to gather their own scattered Flocks, their ministerial Relation to the above Churches, having never been dissolved. But ye came over to scatter the Flocks of honest Ministers, and to gather them again for yourselves.

2^{dly}. There was then an extream Necessity; there was not then one Presbyterian Minister in the North of *Ireland*, but all had been either cut off by the Sword, or else had fled to *Scotland* or *England*, for their Lives. But when ye came, there were almost one hundred and fifty regular ordain'd Ministers; so that your coming, as so many supernumerary *Levites*, was intirely needless. Whatever need some of you had of *Ireland*, it had no need of you. Nay even *Mr. Hut-ton*, one of your Number, own'd to *Mr. King*, that he knew there was a considerable Number of sound, faithful Ministers, belonging to the General Synod.

You add, Page 82, "Nor have we any Account, that the General Assembly delay'd sustaining the People's Petitions and Complaints, ay and until they were first actually dismiss'd from their former Ministers. No, but forthwith dispatch'd their Missionaries to supply them with Preaching, &c. without fear of being justly charged with an irregular and unprecedented Practice in this Matter; neither d d the Associate Judicatures think it proper to delay, &c." 1st. I reply, it was not prudent for you to delay your coming, for had some of the People in *Ireland* gotten a little longer Time to hear and consider your Behaviour

in *Scotland*, they would have had enough of you, before you came; so it was best for you to strike the Iron while it was hot, to embrace the first Opportunity, for fear you should not get another. I have shewn also, that in 1642, there was no living Presbyterian Minister in *Ireland*, to dismiss the People from. But the Case was quite otherwise when ye came to *Ireland*. So that the Conduct of the Assembly can be no Precedent for you any otherwise than a legal Execution is a Precedent for private Murder.

The second Precedent which you produce, is as little to the Purpose to justify your Conduct as the first, namely, the Practice of the General Synod's Committee, 1726, in supplying the People of *Ahoghill* and *Antrim*. For,

1st. The Committee had for many Years personally known the Ministers of these two Congregations, to have publickly maintained in the Synod (until they had been lately cast out) such Principles as gave the People Ground for conscientious Scruples; so that they knew it was not Caprice, Pett, and Humour, that mov'd them; but really tender Conscience: But you had only your Reports from mere Strangers, whose Faces you had never seen before, whose Characters you knew not; which Reports I have solidly proven, in this Paper, to have been malicious, and groundless.

2^{dly}. The People in these two Congregations, before they were under the pastoral Inspection of their then present Ministers, had been under the Care of the General Synod; had always subjected themselves willingly to its Discipline and Government, and were willing to continue their Relation to it: The Synod therefore could not cast off those People, tho' it had justly cast out their former Pastors. But was this the Case with respect to the Associate Presbytery and the People in *Ireland*? by no Means, there is nothing parallel here to your Case and Conduct.

3^{dly}. The Committee were vastly better acquainted with the moral Characters of many in these two Congregations, than ye possibly could be in *Scotland*, with mere Strangers in *Ireland*, of whom ye knew little or nothing.

4^{thly}. The Committee expressly enjoin the Presbyteries, to which they annex the two Congregations, and all others, to take Care that the People who shall withdraw from the Ministry of Non-subscribers, pay all their Arrears of Stipends due to their former Pastors. Now was any thing like this (to make the Parallel hold) done by you *Seceders*? By no

Means; this was not done in *Moyra*, when ye took the People under your Care; neither the Executors of Mr. *Greighton* were paid the Arrears, nor the Probationers the Student-Money. And I have too good Reason to know, that ye are guilty of the same Omission in other Places also. Perhaps it's a Principle of Conscience with you, not to make People pay for preaching, which ye make them believe, poison'd them. Justice between Man and Man in such Cases, ye don't seem to lay much Stress upon. For indeed it is but a Second-table Duty. But perhaps ye think with the *Papists*, "that no Faith is to be kept with Here-ticks", for such you reckon the Members of the General Synod.

To as little Purpose is your third Precedent, which you bring for your coming here, Page 83, viz. the Practice of the *Scots* Reformers 1662, in sending their Missionaries to *Aberdeen*, to preach there, and to treat with that People to take the national Covenant. Every Body in the least acquainted with the History of the *Scottish* Church knows that then that Church was *Ecclesia Turbata*, i.e. in an unsettled and disturbed State; and that some, nay many Things, are necessary to be done in such a State, which are not expedient nor lawful in a settled and peaceable State; and this is the Reason which Messrs. *Henderson* and *Dickson* give for sending the Missionaries there, to justify their own Conduct. But however well this Distinction justify'd their Conduct in that Case, it can by no Means justify you in what you have done. For our Church was not in a disturbed, but in a quiet and settled State, when ye came over; and if it be now disturbed, ye are the Authors and Causes of its Disturbance; and you have this to account for, to our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, the supreme King and Head of it. With equal Justice may a Number of covetous Rebels, when they have rais'd an intestine War, and seiz'd their Neighbour's Goods, justify their Conduct by the above Distinction, as you can do what you have done, by saying that many things may be done in a disturb'd State of a Nation, or in a State of War, which ought not to be done in a State of Peace. But every Body of the least Penetration, would readily see the horrid Villainy through the thin Cover of the aforesaid Distinction, as every honest wise Man sees yours. The above Distinction has been frequently abus'd, by proud, covetous, self-seeking Men, to cover their Crime from

from the Eyes of poor, weak, ignorant, credulous People, while they were thrusting their Sickles into other Mens Fields, i.e. intruding into other Mens Congregations.

Thus (I hope to the Conviction of every unprejudic'd Mind) I have made it appear, that there is nothing in all these three Instances you have produc'd, that is parrallel to your Case, or can serve as a Precedent to justify your irregular Conduct. It's true you say, Page 83, you "could multiply authentic Precedents"; but unless they be more to the Purpose than those three you have given, you had as good save yourself the trouble. And as People usually put the best Argument foremost, so it's rational to believe you have done with your Precedents; and, bad tho' they are, it's probable you have none better behind. The Conduct of no well regulated Church on Earth, in any given Instance, can be a Precedent to justify your irregular Conduct.

Were it not for swelling this Answer to too great a Bulk, I might solidly and particularly confute what you say, Page 87, that "the General Synod have not the Marks or Notes whereby the true Church of Christ is known; as they stand in the XIXth Article of the old *Scots* Confession, viz. 1st. The true preaching of the Word; 2d. The right Administration of the Sacraments; 3d. Ecclesiastical Discipline." But I have anticipated my self already, in the Answers I have given in this Paper to your several groundless Accusations, to which I refer my Reader. To sum up all in a few Words, for the Truth of which we appeal to the Supreme Judge.

In the 1st Place, that we preach the Word in Purity, we deliver nothing to God's People, but what we believe is agreeable to his Word; we keep back nothing from them that is profitable for them to know of the whole revealed Will of God, either relating to Faith or Practice; we teach them Repentance toward God, and Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, and to observe all Things whatsoever he hath commanded: And so we hope we shall be pure from the Blood of all Men. Indeed we don't teach our People for Doctrines the Commandments of Men, nor is it our Custom to rail against our Neighbours; we cannot see any close Connection between preaching and railing, tho' some by their Practice seem to think otherwise.

2dly, We administer the two Sacraments of the New Testament in their original Purity, and Gospel Simplicity,

free of any Mixture of human Invention, only to such as we know have a Right to them, according to the Rules of the Gospel: Indeed we do not lay Obstacles in their Way in order to their Admission, to make them swear some things that are absolutely false, and other things that are Matters of doubtful Disputation; as the Custom of some is, who pretend to be the great Lights and Reformers of the Age.

3dly, In our Exercise of Discipline, in separating the pure from the vile, we have no respect of Persons, we keep habitually these Words of the Apostle to the Evangelist in our Eye, and in our Mind; *them that sin rebuke before all, that others also may fear. I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Elect Angels, that thou observe these Things, without preferring one before another, doing nothing by Partiality, 1 Tim. v. 20, 21.*

But you seem to have repented in charging the Synod with wanting these three Marks of the True Church, because within a Page or two, namely in the 90th, you positively assert, that you believe there are pious Christians or Christ's little Flock, among the Ministers and People belonging to the General Synod: Your Words are these, "I frankly own, that I comfortably hope, and charitably believe, there are pious Christians in the Protestant Churches of Scotland, England, Germany, America, &c. yea among the Independants and Anabaptists in England, as also among the Ministers and People belonging to the General Synod of Ulster in Ireland, which are of Christ's little Flock." Now, if Ministers and People belonging to the Synod, according to your own Confession, be Christ's little Flock, why came ye into Ireland as ravenous Wolves or Beasts of Prey to scatter Christ's Flock from Christ's Shepherds?

2dly, If we be pious Christians, and Christ's Flock, we are Christ's Church; for Christ's little Flock, and Christ's Church, are synonymous Terms in Scripture, or Words of the same Meaning and Signification. Now how can you say Pages 87, and 88, that we have not the Marks of the true Church, and yet expressly say Page 90, that you believe we are, both Ministers and People, pious Christians, and Christ's little Flock, *i. e.* his Church? How consistently with what you own here can you say frequently thro' your

your Pamphlet, that neither our Synod nor its inferior Judicatories are right and lawful Courts of Christ? You of all the Writers ever I saw, abound with the greatest Inconsistencies, and self-Contradictions. But after the late charitable Declaration you have made Page 90, in owning us as pious Christians, and Christ's little Flock; I should not be so severe upon you, for Charity covers a Multitude of Sins. Seeing then we have proven from your own Confession, that we Ministers and People are Christ's little Flock; how consistent has your Conduct been with this Confession, in all Minister's Congregations promiscuously, who belong to the Synod, setting up your Tents, and preaching, in order to draw off their Hearers, to your Party? Your Conduct herein plainly shews to the World, that you valued not a Straw, whose Flock they had been, provided they would become your Flock, that you might get the Fleece.

Now that you are in the Church, which is Christ's Fold; let us enquire next, how you came in; you tell us Page 89, "that "You know the Church is called the House of God, and the Door of it by which a Minister enters in to perform religious Services, is *Janua Bisaria* a two-leaf'd Door; the Call of the People is one Leaf, and the Appointment of the Presbytery is the other Leaf, and "you have both." I answer briefly, you assert here a very dangerous Nontruth, nay a pestilential Heresie; for the Door of the Church of God has but one Leaf, and Christ Jesus is that Leaf, yea the whole of the Door, as he says himself, *Jo. n. x. 9. I am the Door.* How dare you contradict our Saviour, to say that the Door into the Church of God has two Leaves, when he says, it has but one? Or how dare you say, that the Call of the People, and the Appointment of the Presbytery are the two Leaves of this Door, when he says expressly, that he is the Door himself? Is there any thing in the most suspicious Paragraph, in all Mr. Carisle's Sermon, of as dangerous Tendency as this Assertion of yours, to put our Lord Jesus Christ out of his Place, as the Door of the Church, and to put the self-erected Presbytery of *Glasgow*, and the giddy People who are your Followers, in his stead; let all impartial Christian Readers judge? What a poor Figure you make, by your Entrance into the Church, by the Appointment of the self-erected Presbytery, and the Call of the giddy, unsettled, foolish, weak people, setting aside precious Christ!—You take notice, that you

you have the Call of the People, but you are perfectly silent, of your having the Call of God, which is of infinitely more Importance; which Mr. *Ebenezer Erskine*, Page 14 of his synodical Sermon says, consists in God's qualifying a Man for the Work, and inspiring him with an holy Zeal, and Desire to employ these Qualifications for the Glory of God, and the Good of his Church; which he seems to have borrow'd from the learned and pious *Durham's* Exposition of the *Revelation*. Now what a poor and despicable Figure must you make, in the Eyes of judicious pious Christians, when you came not in by precious Christ, the Door, nor had the Call of God for your Coming! Must it not hold true concerning you, that God hath not sent you, yet you ran; and therefore, you shall not profit this People at all? But I understand you are not singular in denying the Honour of his own House to Christ as King, for one of your Brethren in this Neighbourhood, who had a certain Difference with one of his Hearers, when the Man propos'd to leave the Difference to the Decision of the Presbytery; No, replies the Minister, I am King in my own Court, meaning his Session, and there it shall be try'd. The Man thought it was very hard, that the Minister should be both Judge, and Party; but could get no Remedy; for where there is a King, there is Power, and who may say unto him what doest thou? I thought, that Christ ought to be own'd as sole King in all the Courts and Judicatures of the Church, *Eph. i. 22. And gave him to be Head over all Things to the Church*. But it seems it is not so in the *Seceders* Church, they don't choose to come in by him, as the Door, but only by the Call of the People, and Appointment of the self erected Presbytery. They build their Church themselves, and they keep the Kingship among themselves; for every Man of them it seems, is sole King in his own Court or Session. This can be proven by the Oath of the Man to whom it was said, and who has been five or six Years a *Seceder*. Is not this inconsistent with *Presbyterianism*, in denying the due Subordination of the inferior to the superior Judicatures of the Church? And not only so, but far worse, inconsistent with Christianity itself, in denying Christ's Kingly Government over his own Courts.

I would now make two Remarks upon two Paragraphs of Mr. *Ebenezer Erskine's* synodical Sermon, from *Psalm* cxviii. 22. which first began Seceding in *Scotland*; Page 14
he

he has these Words, *viz.* "There is a twofold Call necessary for a Man who meddles as a Builder in the Church of God; there is a Call of God, and of the Church: God's Call consists in his qualifying a Man for the Work, and in inspiring him with an holy Zeal and Desire to employ these Qualifications for the Glory of God, and the Good of his Church. The Call of the Church lies in the free Choice and Election of the Christian People; The Promise of Conduct and Council in the Choice of Men that are to build the Church is not made to *Patrons*, *Heritors*, or any other particular Set of Men, but to the Church, the Body of Christ, to whom Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors and Teachers are given."

I would observe here, that in order to establish a popular Call or free Choice of the People, he quite overlooks the Call of the Presbytery, *viz.* their Invitation and Call to a young Man to enter upon first Tryals in a regular way, to preach the Word; and again their calling and beseeching him to accept of the People's Call to be their Minister, and solemnly setting him apart, by Fasting and Prayer, and Imposition of Hands for the regular and full Discharge of the ministerial Office. *Incidit in scyllam cupiens vitare charybdis*; shunning one Extreme, he falls into another as dangerous, if not more so. He seems entirely to quit the Presbyterian Scheme, and to fall in with the wild Sectarian Way of those who maintain, that wherever God has given Gifts and an Inclination (which perhaps is no more than a mere Enthusiastick Fancy of the Man's own Brain) and an Encouragement is given by the People; a Man may without any presbyterial Order preach the Word, and administer the Sacraments—he says, the Promise of Conduct and Council in the Choice of Men that are to build the Church is not made to *Patrons*, *Heritors*, or any other Set of Men, but to the Church, the Body of Christ; to whom *Apostles*, *Prophets*, *Evangelists*, *Pastors* and *Teachers* are given. Now here, as he puts Christian People, *i. e.* the Hearers, in Opposition to the Apostles and Teachers, and says that the Promise of Conduct and Council in the Choice of Men that are to build the Church is only made to them, *i. e.* to common Christian People: I reply, this is a gross Mistake, and very false Assertion. That the Promise is not made to *Patrons* and *Heritors* as such, we readily allow; but that the Promise is not made to any other particular Set of Men, is false; for

for the Promise of Conduct and Counsel in the Choice of Men to build the Church, is made to another Set of Men, distinct both from Patrons and Heiritors, and the Christian People considered as such; namely to the Holy Apostles, and to the Pastors and Teachers of the Christian Church as their Successors; *Math. xxviii. 19, 20. Go ye therefore and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: And lo, I am with you always, even unto the End of the World.* Where we have the Promise of God for Counsel and Conduct in the Whole of their Office: One chief Part of which is, to be directed in the Choice of fit Persons to succeed them in preaching the Gospel. And it is observable, that the Choice of fit Persons to build the Church of God, *2 Tim. ii. 2.* is given by the Apostle not to the common Christian People, but to the Evangelist, in Conjunction no doubt with the Presbytery. *The Things that thou hast heard of me among many Witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful Men, who shall be able to teach others also.* Where it is observable, that it is not by the common Christian People, but by the Evangelist that the Choice is to be made; perhaps the Choice of the Deacons, *Acts vi. 3.* is the only Place in the Holy Scriptures where the first Choice of Church-Officers is made by the common Christian People: And tho' some of these Deacons became Preachers afterwards, yet consider'd as Deacons, they were not to be Builders of the Church of God, but only Overseers of the Poor. And so these Words in the *Acts, Look ye out among you seven Men of honest Report, &c.* make nothing to the Purpose of the Christian common People's having a Right before the Presbytery have chosen and called the Man, to call him to be a Builder in the House of God. The due Order of these several Calls is as follows; 1st, A Man ought to have the Call of God, as has been above asserted. 2d, He ought to have the Call and Invitation of the Presbytery, and by them to be try'd, and approv'd, and licens'd and appointed to preach the Gospel; which he seems intirely to have omitted. 3d, He ought to have the Call and free Invitation of the Christian People, and ought not to be intruded upon them against their Wills; and lastly, he ought to have the Call and Invitation of the Presbytery, to accept of the People's Call, and to be by them solemnly set apart, for the full and faithful Discharge of the ministerial Office, by Fasting, Prayer, and Imposition of Hands; which last Call he

has

has also altogether overlook'd, to become more popular, to ingratiate himself with the common People, making their Choice to stand instead of both their own Call, and the Presbyteries also; because he foresaw that he should not have the Concurrence of any regular Presbytery in calling Builders to erect the new *Sceding* Church.

Though in the last quoted Paragraph he made the Promise of Conduct and Direction peculiar to the Christian People in calling a Builder, exclusive of every other Set of Men whatsoever, even Pastors and Teachers not excepted; yet in Page 29 he attributes a great Power to Ministers, the Fellow-builders of the House of God, even a Power of discerning and knowing with Certainty the saving Grace of God in the Heart of the Man who is to be employ'd as a Fellow-mason with them. "If Ministers of the Gospel be Builders of the House, then see hence the need of trying a Man's Acquaintance with Christ, and the Power of Religion, before he be admitted into ministerial Communion as a Fellow-builder in the House of God—Masons know one another, they have certain Signs and Words by which they are capable to distinguish Men of their own Art and Business from others; so skilful Builders in the House of God are capable by a spiritual Discerning, to know who are fit to be admitted to the Work of the Lord and who not." Can Mr. *Erskine* believe that Ministers know with as great Certainty the Reality of Saving Grace in the Hearts of those that are Candidates for the Holy Ministry, as Free-masons know one another? If he had had such a Spirit of Discerning who were fit and who not, to be employ'd in the Work, sure he never would have employ'd Mr. *Moncrief*, Mr. *Gib*, and others of the *Antiburges-men*, who have now call himself, his Brother *Ralph*, Mr. *Fisher*, Mr. *Black*, &c. out of the Work, excommunicated them, and delivered them over to Satan, as unfaithful Builders: Surely in the new erected *Sceding* Presbytery he has wanted this Spirit of Discerning, or if he had it, he made a bad Use of it. But in all the World what had he to do with Masons Signs, and the Mason-Word in his synodical Sermon? Was not the Tavern a far more proper Place to mention this than in the Pulpit, and the House of God? He adds, "If such a Discerning be given even to Church Members, as to try the Spirits, whether they be of God, because many false Prophets are gone abroad in the World, 1 *John* iv. 1. Much more may it be suppos'd that

"that this discerning Faculty is to be found among faithful Ministers of the Gospel."—It is not the inward Grace of the Heart which the Apostle would have them to try (which no Man can infallibly know in another, without a particular personal Revelation) but the Scope and Tendency of the Doctrine, and the Way whereby they should know, was briefly this, *Hereby ye know the Spirit of God, every Spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the Flesh is of God; and every Spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the Flesh, is not of God.*—This was the *Criterion* of Truth by which they were to try the Spirits; the Exercise of the noble *Be- reans* seems to be here only recommended by the Apostle *John* to make the best Use they could of their Bibles, *Acts* xvii. 11. *Who searched the Scriptures daily, whether these Things were so that were spoken by Paul.* But as the Words stand connected in Mr. *Erskine's* Sermon, they seem to imply that the extraordinary Gift of the Holy Ghost, conferred upon some at the Day of *Pentecost*, which the Apostles sometimes exercis'd, particularly with respect to *Ananias* and *Saphira*, *Simon Magus*, &c. was continued still in the Christian Church to this Day, of which Gift the Apostle speaks, *1 Cor.* xii. 10. *To another the Discerning of Spirits, i. e.* a Power wherein for the further Authority and Credit of the Gospel in the primitive Times, God communicated to some Men something of his own Prerogative to discern Mens inward Thoughts and Hearts, and to make Judgment of their Truth and Sincerity, or contrarywise of their Falseness and Hypocrisy. To believe this Power now to be continued in the Church in either Ministers or private Christians, is meer Enthusiasm. Some *Seceders* in this Neighbourhood, probably from reading this Sermon, make very high Pretences to this Faculty of Discerning of Spirits; for instance, one of them told a Member of the establish'd Church of *Ireland*, that he "plainly saw the Devil looking out of the Curate's Face as he preach'd in the Pulpit." Page 22d & 23d, having enquir'd whence it was that the *Jewish* Builders rejected *CHRIST*, he answers, "it was from mistaken Notions of the Nature of the Messiah's Kingdom, expecting him as a glorious secular Prince." Which indeed is very true, but then the Comparison he makes of the present Ministers of the establish'd Church of *Scotland* with the *Jews*, is very ill-natur'd and unjust, in those Words, "I am perswaded that carnal Notions of the King-

dom

dom of *Christ*, which is not of this World, lie at the Bottom of many of the Evils and Corruptions of the Day we live in." Can it be possible that he believes that the Ministers of the establish'd Church of *Scotland* are perswaded with the *Jews*, that *Jesus of Nazareth* is not the *Messiah*! and that they expect the *Messiah* is yet to come as a secular Prince, and to have his Kingdom of this World? or that they are with the *Millenarians* or *Chilists*, expecting *Christ* shortly to come down and to reign on Earth with the Saints a thousand Years? One of these Things he insinuates by these Words. This Fear of his, is perfectly pannick, chimerical and groundless: There is no Minister in the Church of *Scotland* has any such Thoughts, or Expectations; they know that *Jesus* is the *CHRIST* or *MESSIAH*, and they expect no other; they know there is no other Name under Heaven given, among Men, whereby we must be saved; they know that his Kingdom is of a spiritual Nature, and not of this World, because himself hath told us so; and they know that it is not on Earth, but in Heaven that his Saints shall reign with him.

SECTION IV.

Containing some Remarks upon what Mr. Clark has laid down for The COVENANT of GRACE, in the 4th Section of the Survey, Page 98th and 99th.

I SHALL herein shew my Reader, that he has quite mistaken the Covenant of Grace, and that what he gives us in said Pages for it, is not at all the Covenant of Grace, but the Covenant of Redemption. This I will briefly do, by laying down the Scheme of the Covenant of Redemption and the Covenant of Grace, according to the Sum of Saving Knowledge, by Messrs. *Dickson*, *Durham*, &c. 1650, bound up with our Confession of Faith; and also, the Plans of those distinct Covenants in the Rev'd Mr. *David Dickson's* *Therapeutica Sacra*. Mr. *Clark's* Definition of it is as followeth, "The Covenant of Grace, which is that gracious Stipulation or Agreement enter'd into from Eternity, between the Father and the Son, concerning foreseen lost Sinners of Mankind, wherein the Father propos'd to the Son, that if he would assume the human Nature, and in the Sinner's Room magnify the broken Law, and pour out his Soul unto the Death an offering for Sin; in order to satisfy offended Justice; then, and upon that Condition,

K

he

“ he would prepare him a Body, strengthen him with his Arm, and be ever well pleased with his Seed, for his Righteousness Sake; whom as a Reward of his stupendious Work, he should see a numerous and willing People in the Day of Power, and be exalted a Prince, to receive the Gifts of Faith, Repentance, and all saving Graces; to give unto Men, even to such as did rebel, that God the Lord might dwell among them.”

“ Unto this Proposal and Condition, the Son as Mediator, readily answer’d, and heartily agreed, saying, Lo! I come, as it is written in the Volume of thy Book, content to assume the Body thou has prepared for me; I delight to do thy preceptive Will, O my God! and strictly to fulfil all Righteousness; yea, and as a Lamb to be led to the Slaughter, in the Room and Stead of Mankind Sinners; to bow down the Head, yield up the Ghost, and thus to finish Transgression, to make an End of Sin, and bring in everlasting Righteousness.”

Our pious Scots Divines in the *Sum of Saving Knowledge* in our Confession of Faith, give us the following Definition of the *Covenant of Redemption*, Page 155, “ The Sum of the Covenant of Redemption is this; God having freely chosen unto Life, a certain Number of lost Mankind, for the Glory of his rich Grace, did give them before the World began, unto God the Son, appointed Redeemer, that, upon Condition he would humble himself so far, as to assume the human Nature of a Soul and a Body, unto personal Union with his Divine Nature, and submit himself to the Law, as Surety for them, and satisfy Justice for them, by giving Obedience in their Name, even to the suffering of the cursed Death of the Cross, he should ransom and redeem them all from Sin and Death, and purchase unto them Righteousness and eternal Life, with all saving Graces leading thereunto, to be effectually by Means of his own Appointment, applied unto every one of them.

“ This Condition the Son of God (who is Jesus Christ our Lord) did accept before the World began, and in the fulness of Time came into the World, was born of the Virgin Mary, subjected himself to the Law, and completely paid the Ransom on the Cross.”

The reverend, pious and learned *David Dickson* in his *Therapeutica Sacra*, P. 38, says, “ This Covenant of Redemption then may be thus describ’d,—It is a Bargain agreed

“ agreed upon between the Father and the Son, designed a Mediator, concerning the Elect (lying with the rest of Mankind in a State of Sin and Death, procur’d by their own Merit) wisely and powerfully to be converted, sanctified and saved for the Son of God’s Satisfaction and Obedience (in our Nature to be assum’d by him) to be given in due Time to the Father, even to the Death of the Cross.”

I shall next lay down the Plan of the *Covenant of Grace*, as the aforesaid Divines have express’d it in the *Sum of Saving Knowledge*, in our Confession, Page 159, “ The Sum of the Gospel, or Covenant of Grace and Reconciliation, is this,—If thou flee from deserved Wrath, to the true Redeemer Jesus Christ (who is able to save to the uttermost all that come unto God through him) thou shalt not perish, but have eternal Life,” *Rom. x.* 8, 9, 11.

The Covenant of Grace by the aforesaid judicious and pious Mr. *David Dickson* in his *Therapeutica Sacra*, Page 126 is express’d thus:—“ The Covenant of Grace” (saith he) “ is a Contract between God and Man, procur’d by Christ upon these Terms, that whosoever in the Sense of their own Sinfulness, shall receive Christ Jesus offered in the Gospel, for Righteousness and Life, shall have him and all the Benefits purchas’d by him, according to the Covenant of Redemption; and that God will be his God, and the God of his Children.”

I shall next give you the Words of the reverend and pious Mr. *Flavel*, with respect to the Covenant of Grace, and the Covenant of Redemption, Vol. I. Page 676, &c. where speaking of the *Antinomian* Errors, he says,

“ They will not allow the New Covenant to be made properly with us, but with Christ for us. And some of them affirm, that this Covenant is all of it a Promise, having no Condition upon our Part, but upon Christ’s; consequently affirm that he repented, believed and obeyed for us.

“ The confounding of distinct Covenants leads them into this Error; we acknowledge there was a Covenant properly made with Christ alone, *i. e.* between him and his Father, which we call the Covenant of Redemption. This Covenant indeed, tho’ it were made for us, yet was it not made with us; it had its Condition, and that Condition was laid only upon Christ: *viz.* that he should assume our Nature, and pour out his Soul unto Death;

“ which Condition he was solely concern’d to perform ;
 “ but besides this, there is a *Covenant of Grace* made
 “ with him, and with all Believers in him : With him *pr-*
 “ *marly* as the Head, with them as Members, who person-
 “ ally come into this Covenant, when they come into Uni-
 “ on with him by Faith. This Covenant of Grace is not
 “ made with Christ alone, personally consider’d, but with
 “ Christ and all that are his, mylically consider’d, and is
 “ properly made with all Believers in Christ, and there-
 “ fore is called their Covenant. *Zech. ix. 11.*

“ This Covenant of Grace made with Believers in Christ,
 “ is not the same, nor must it be confounded with the Cove-
 “ nant of *Redemption* made with Christ before the World
 “ began. They are two distinct Covenants; for in the Co-
 “ venant of Grace, into which Believers are taken, there
 “ is a *Mediator*, and this Mediator is Christ himself; but
 “ in the other *Covenant of Redemption* there neither was,
 “ nor could be any *Mediator*, which manifestly distinguish-
 “ eth them.”

Besides in the Covenant of Grace, Christ bequeaths mani-
 fold and rich Legacies, as he is the Testator, but no Man
 gives a Legacy to himself. This Covenant is really and pro-
 perly made with every Believer as he is a Member of Jesus
 Christ the Head; and they are truly and properly Confederates
 with God: The Covenant binds them to their Duties, and
 encourageth them therein by Promises of Strength, to be
 derived from Christ to enable them thereunto, as *Paul* saith
Phil. iv. 13. I can do all Things through Christ which
strengtheneth me.

Professor *Dickson* in his *Therapeutica Sacra*, Page 25,
 hath these Words; “ A Divine Covenant we call a *Contrast*
 “ or *Passion*, wherein God is at least the one Party Con-
 “ tracter. Of this sort of Covenants about the eternal Sal-
 “ vation of Men there are *three*. The first is the Cove-
 “ nant of Redemption past between God and Christ appoint-
 “ ed Mediator before the World was, in the Council of the
 “ Trinity. The 2d is, the Covenant of Works, made be-
 “ tween God and Man, in *Adam* in his Integrity, indued
 “ with all natural Perfections enabling him to keep it, so
 “ long as it pleased him to stand to the Condition. The 3d
 “ is the Covenant of Grace and Reconciliation through
 “ Christ, made between God and Believers (with their Chil-
 “ dren) in Christ.”

From what I have quoted from the Writings of the above
 venerable and judicious Divines, it appears to be the receiv’d
 Doctrine of the Protestant reform’d Church of *Scotland*,
 and of the orthodox Dissenters in *England*, that the Cove-
 nant of Redemption and the Covenant of Grace are not one
 and the same, but really and truly two distinct Covenants;
 the one made from Eternity between the Father and the Son,
 the other made in Time (after the Covenant of Works was
 broken) between God and the Elect in Christ; the first hav-
 ing no Mediator, nor needed any, there being no Difference
 between the Parties contracting: And the second has a Me-
 diator, even Christ Jesus. The one has Sacraments annex’d
 to it for the Confirmation of our Faith; namely Baptism
 and the Lord’s Supper. The other had none, nor needed
 any, the Father and Son firmly trusting in one another’s Ve-
 racity without any Seals. it appears,

2dly, By comparing what Mr. *Clark* has laid down for
 the Covenant of Grace, with what these learned and godly
 Divines call the Covenant of Grace, that he has quite mistak-
 en it, and given us the Covenant of Redemption instead of
 it; and this is what all the *Antinomians* constantly do, in
 order to exempt Men from having any Conditions to per-
 form, because Christ has undoubtedly fully perform’d all the
 Conditions that he engaged with the Father for, in the Co-
 venant for our Redemption.

3dly, From what has been said, none need be offended
 because we assert that there are three Divine Covenants;
 for though the Father has made three, he has made but two
 with Man, *viz.* the Covenant of Works and the Covenant
 of Grace. For though the Covenant of Redemption was
 made for Man, *i. e.* for the Elect’s Benefit, it was not made
 with Man but with Christ, before he assumed the human
 Nature, even from Eternity. The Covenant of Works was
 made at the Creation of Man, and the Covenant of Grace
 immediately after the Fall.

I come now to speak to the Conditionality of the Co-
 venant of Grace, according as I have laid down the Plan
 of it from the *Sum of Saving Knowledge* bound up with
 our Confession of Faith.

This Question, whether the Covenant of Grace be con-
 ditional or absolute, was moved at the Reformation, on
 account of the Controversy between the *Protestants* and
Papists about Justification: Among the *Protestants* some
 deny’d, and others affirm’d the Conditionality of it: Those
 who

who deny'd it, did it out of Fear of mingling the Law and the Gospel, Christ's Righteousness and Man's, as the *Papists* had wickedly done before : Those who affirm'd it, did it out of Fear also, lest the Necessity of Faith and Holiness being relax'd, *Libertinism* or *Antinomianism* should be introduc'd. But if the Question was duly stated, and the Sense of the Terms agreed upon, the Gospel Covenant or Covenant of Grace may be affirm'd to be conditional, to secure the People of God from *Liberinism*, without the least Diminution of the Righteousness of Christ, or clouding the free Grace of God.

I would observe, in the 99th Page of the *Survey*, you quite alter the State of the Controversy between us ; for you say, " the Question between us is precisely this, *viz.* " Whether Faith or Repentance or both be the primary and " comprehensive Condition of the Covenant of Grace, " upon the fulfilling of which that Pardon and Eternal " Life promis'd, becomes due to the Believer, as a Debt " of Reward, for this his Work of Faith". This you positively deny, and we deny it also. But the Question is, whether or no *Faith instrumentally consider'd*, as it receives Christ, *John* i. 12. tho' it be neither perfect in Degree, nor in the least meritorious of the Benefit confer'd, nor perform'd in our own natural Strength, be not required of us in order to our partaking of the Benefits of the Covenant of Grace ; In this Sense we affirm Faith to be a Condition, without which we cannot be saved ; and in this sober and sound Sense all our *Westminster* Divines allow Faith to be the Condition of the Covenant. See *Jeremiah Burroughs's Moses's Self-Denial*, Page 188. Mr. *Perkins* says, " The Covenant of Grace is that whereby God freely promising Christ and his Benefits, exacts again of Man, " that he by Faith receive Christ." See Mr. *Dickson* in his *Therapeutica Sacra*. See also Mr. *John Grail* in his modest Vindication of the Covenant of Grace. See *Cameron's Detriplice sedere, parous, Wendeline, Wallaus, Rivet*, &c. " Man by his Fall having made himself incapable of Life by that Covenant, the Lord was pleas'd " to make a second, commonly called the Covenant of " Grace : Wherein he freely offereth unto Sinners Life and " Salvation by Jesus Christ, requiring of them Faith in him, " that they may be saved ; and promising to give unto all " those that are ordained unto Life, his holy Spirit, to make " them willing, and able to believe." Conf. Chap. VII.

Art.

Art. 3. " The Grace of God is manifested in the second " Covenant, in that he freely provideth and offereth to Sinners a Mediator, and Life and Salvation by him, and requiring Faith as the Condition to interest them in him, " promiseth and giveth his holy Spirit, to all his Elect, " to work in them that Faith, with all other saving Graces, " and to enable them to all holy Obedience, as the Evidence of the Truth of their Faith, and Thankfulness to God, and as the Way he hath appointed them to Salvation." Larger Catechism in the Ans. to Quest. 32.

Time would fail me to quote Authors to this Purpose, and the whole Current of Scripture runs in this same Channel.

I would in Conclusion, address myself to the People who may be solicited by the *Seceders* to join with them. When they ask you according to their usual Method, WILL YE JOIN US IN A WITNESSING WAY? Tell them that ye dare not, for fear you should break God's Law ; for he hath expressly said, *Thou shalt not bear false Witness against thy Neighbour* ; and that you have seen clearly that they bear false Witness against the General Synod : That you have consider'd the Scope and Tendency of their Sermons in general is, to encrease Schisms and Divisions ; to cool Christian Love instead of promoting it ; to traduce and malign the faithful Ministers of the Gospel ; to four and prejudice the Minds of their Hearers against them ; and consequently to obstruct and mar their Edification, and to subvert all Peace and good Order in the Church of Christ.

I would have you in the second Place to consider also how inconsistent their daily Practice is with the Terms of their Association, as you have them express'd Page 117 of their Act annexed the Terms of ministerial and Christian Communion, form'd at *Edinburgh Feb. 14, 1744*. " The " Presbytery did, and hereby do agree, resolve and determine, that the Renovation of the national Covenant of " Scotland, and the Solemn League and Covenant of the " three Nations, in the manner now agreed upon, and " propos'd by the Presbytery, shall be the Terms of Ministerial Communion with this Presbytery, likewise of " Christian Communion in the Admission of the People " to Sealing Ordinances ; secluding therefrom all Opposers, Contemners and Slighters of the said Renovation of our solemn Covenants : And moreover as the Presbytery judge that much Tenderness and Lenity is to be " used with the weakest of Christ's Flock, who are lying " open

" open to Light, and minting to come forward in the same
 " Cause, that they may not be, at first Instance, secluded from
 " Sealing Ordinances; so they agree that all such are to be
 " secluded, who, after deliberate Pains taken for their
 " Information, with all due Meekness and Patience, shall
 " be found by the Session or superior Judicatories they are
 " in Subjection unto, to be *Neglecters* and *Shifters* of
 " this important moral Duty, or not to be themselves in
 " the due Use of Means for Light and Satisfaction there-
 " annent." Nay they had fix'd upon the same Terms, in
 " their *Act Declaration and Testimony* in the Year 1736,
 " which is almost 18 Years ago. Now the *Seceders* who are
 " called the *Burges-men*, or the *Glasgow* Presbytery espe-
 " cially, make but a meer Stalking-horse of the Covenant.
 " They have not put the Covenant to one of their Hearers
 " since they came and settled in *Ireland*, which is now five
 " Years, and upwards; neither at the Administration of Bap-
 " tism, nor of the Lord's Supper: And if their Brethren act so
 " in *Scotland* (as it's rational to believe they do) then in 18
 " Years, if we suppose they administred the Lord's Supper
 " twice in a Year, and some of their Hearers had 7 Children
 " born and baptiz'd in that Space, then they have trampled
 " upon, and broken their own Rule above forty Times. For
 " even according to the Liberty they reserv'd to themselves,
 " they could admit no Man but once to a sealing Ordinance,
 " until he had taken the Covenant; and even the *Antibur-*
 " *ges-men* themselves make little of it; as Mr. *Lusk*, who
 " was many Years of that Party tells us, Page 27, " That it
 " is notorious that many in that Neighbourhood have got
 " Privileges with them, who solemnly deny that ever they
 " took the Covenant; and others have had Children bap-
 " tiz'd with them, who agreed with the Minister to be laid
 " under no Obligations but what the Ministers in this
 " Country lay them under;" What monstrous inconsisten-
 " cy is this! To pretend to keep these Terms sacredly and in-
 " violably, and yet for the one Party to break them so fre-
 " quently, and the other so constantly; was ever such Dou-
 " ble-Dealing with God and Man seen or known! That the
 " Lord may pity the poor divided and distracted State of
 " this Church, confirm those in Truth that have yet escap'd
 " the Snare, and open the Eyes of those that are deluded,
 " is the earnest Wish and Prayer of your Servant in the Gos-
 " pel of Christ.